

We cannot notice any communication unless accompanied by the name and address of the writer.

* Any error or delay occurring in the transmission of this Journal should be immediately communicated to the Publisher.

THE SOLICITORS' JOURNAL.

LONDON, NOVEMBER 2, 1861.

CURRENT TOPICS.

Michaelmas Term opens to-day, when the new Lord Chancellor holds his first levee, which will, no doubt, be well attended both by judges and counsel; and he need not be in any great hurry to get early to Westminster Hall, so far as the business of his court is concerned. For some reason or other the long vacation seems to have produced an unusually small amount of business, except applications for injunctions to V. C. Wood, the vacation judge, of which there were a large number. Whether the present low state of the cause list is owing to the paucity of arrears at the rising of the Court in August last, or to the actual falling off of business, we are unable to say. The former cause, however, is sufficient to account for the fact to some extent. We subjoin a statement, shewing the number of causes set down for hearing at the sitting of the Court twelve months ago, and to-day.

Cases before the Court, Michaelmas Term:—

	1860	1861
Appeals	26	23
Master of the Rolls	89	62
Vice-Chancellor Kindersley	53	38
Vice-Chancellor Stuart	95	64
Vice-Chancellor Wood	159	124
	422	311

The common law courts seem to be somewhat better off. In the Queen's Bench there are 12 enlarged rules, and 27 demurrers, special cases, and county court appeals for argument, besides 26 cases on the new trial paper, which, altogether, is more than there was in the same court for Michaelmas Term last year. In the Court of Exchequer there are 15 cases of error or appeals for argument, and 12 demurrers and special cases. This is an improvement on last year. The paper of the Court of Common Pleas also presents a fair show of work for the new Term; and, upon the whole, the courts at Westminster appear to be in a more prosperous condition than those at Lincoln's-inn.

Our contemporary, the *Law Times*, in days of yore used to contain some amusing articles, intended for the special benefit of those who wanted to become "advocates," and still more recently, has been trying to teach unfortunate law-students whose manners have been neglected, the importance of polite enunciation, and the misfortune of speaking through their nose; together with much more of such like instruction, which, no doubt, will be duly appreciated by the majority of these young gentlemen. The same schoolmaster is now abroad amongst those unhappy writing clerks who fain would scramble over the barrier which an examination throws up between them and the dignity of the shorter robe. Last week this accomplished instructor of the ignorant in our profession addresses these aspirants for professional rank, in language calculated to make a deep impression, if not upon their minds, certainly upon the minds of all who know something more of the Latin grammar from which he quotes than the scraps of Latin which it contains. After informing his readers that it is for the interest of the community that the duties of solicitors should be performed by "well-educated gentlemen, fitted for good society, and giving to the world the pledge of honour,

for which social position is the best security," this "well-educated gentleman" and ambitious instructor in all the graces of delivery and arts of composition thus betrays his own want of acquaintance with one of the first and plainest rules of the grammar, not only of the language about which he talks so glibly, but of every other in the civilized world:—"A writing clerk," he says, "who should qualify himself for the profession by acquiring *all this*, who should educate himself in the '*ingenus artes*,' which the Latin grammar tells us '*emolliit mores*,' and who had held the social *status* assigned to a solicitor, would be welcomed into the profession as cordially as if he had been crammed at college." Now, although after this specimen of editorial instruction we are rather shy of giving our friends, the writing clerks, any advice about the approaching examination, we can hardly help advising such of them as have not yet learned the Latin grammar, when they do so, to occupy themselves more with the *rules* that are there laid down than with those bits of Latin which are given by way of examples, and which a certain class of men who know nothing of the grammar itself are very fond of quoting. Legal maxims in the Latin tongue are much more safe, because they seldom require to be taken to pieces in a conversational kind of way; but any one who has got a few of those other aphorisms in his head and nothing else of the language, is sure to be trying to apply them, and then it is very possible that, even with print before his eyes, he may be unable to see that in attempting to shew his knowledge he only betrays a degree of ignorance which those who know him best would hardly suspect to be possible.

Since the new Bankruptcy Act came into operation, it will be seen that we have devoted an unusually large portion of our space to reports of cases interesting to the profession, on account of the points of practice which they decide; and it is our intention to do so until the law under the new Bankruptcy Act shall have become pretty well settled. Up to the present time, the greater part of the business in Basinghall-street, has consisted of the winding-up of old matters to which the Act of 1849, still applies. Those clauses of the Act which are repealed by the recent Act are still in force "as to any proceeding pending, or any right that has arisen or may arise . . . in respect of any transaction, matter, or thing done or existing prior to, or at the commencement of" the Act of 1861, under any provisions of law formerly existing. As the new business increases, however, abundance of points, touching both the law and the procedure of the new court, will turn up, and it shall be our care to report the decisions, not only of the several London commissioners, but of the Court of Appeal. The latter will be carefully reported in the *Weekly Reporter*, and will also receive notice in these pages.

The last number of the *Law Magazine* contains an article upon martial law in Australia, and therein discusses a very interesting question—as to the power not only of governors' of colonies, but of the Queen herself, to enforce martial law amongst her subjects, whether at home or abroad. The question has been raised by the disturbances which have taken place at the gold fields in Australia, and the writer mentions several instances in which a colonial governor has proclaimed martial law. Some of the conclusions at which he arrives, and which are given below, are rather startling. They are as follows:—

1. The Queen of England has no power or authority to exercise martial law either in Great Britain or in the colonies.
2. Within the limits of the Queen's dominions the army and all persons belonging thereto, and under military authority, are to be governed by the Mutiny Acts and the Articles of War.

3. This military law is distinct from, and therefore not to be confounded with, what is called martial law, which is illegal.

4. When the Queen's troops are in the field in a foreign country and *aggravante bello*, they are to be governed by the royal prerogative.

5. These rules do not extend to civil persons not amenable to military authority.

6. The Queen cannot impart to a colonial governor powers which she does not possess, and she has not done so.

7. The governor of a colony is not the general representative of the Queen, and can only exercise the powers lawfully delegated to him by the Queen's commission.

8. Hence:—the exercise of martial law by the governor of a colony is illegal, and would even be so if such power were included in his commission. Not being so included, its exercise amounts to a double usurpation.

The force of flunkeyism could no further go than it did in the *Times* of Thursday last, in its leader upon the visit of the Prince of Wales to the Middle Temple, as the following extract will abundantly show:—

"That he has long been a student of law in a better sense than that implied by eating dinners in any Inn of Court is known and appreciated by the people of this country. He is probably more intimately acquainted with the history of our legal system, and has a better appreciation of the strange medley produced by feudalism, civil law, and modern jurisprudence, than the majority of the students who will emerge from pleaders' and conveyancers' chambers to cheer him."

Now everyone knows that no care or expense has been spared in the education of the Prince of Wales, and assuming that he is possessed of average abilities, the probability is that he is as well educated as most young men of his age; but the statement that he is probably more intimately acquainted with English Law in its history and actual condition than the majority of law students, is so gross an absurdity that it is to be accounted for only as a piece of mendacious flattery. The Prince of Wales, however, has now arrived at an age when he might, with advantage to himself, commence, under proper tuition, the study of our system of English jurisprudence, not for the purpose of qualifying himself for the discharge of the professional duties for which, on Thursday, he was supposed to be already fit; but that it becomes one who is so likely, at some future day, to be the ruler of this country, to have some acquaintance with its laws, and with their history and operation. With such toadies, however, as the writer in the *Times* for his advisers it is not likely that his Royal Highness will think it necessary to acquire much more information on the subject than he may have acquired in the nursery.

A circular has been issued from the Office of the Registrar of Attorneys and Solicitors: it states that the Forms of Declaration and Duplicate, under the 23 & 24 Vic. c. 127 may be had on application at the office; and the members of the profession are requested to be particular in filling them up, either by themselves, their partners, or their London agents; to send them to the office on as early a day as possible; and to attend to the following

REGULATIONS:

1. Every declaration and duplicate must be delivered at the office six days before a certificate can be granted.

2. No certificate will be delivered out till Wednesday, November 20th.

3. In the first six days, commencing on November 20th, certificates will be delivered only to such London agents as shall in due time previously have sent in the declaration of themselves and their country clients, accompanied by a list thereof arranged in alphabetical order, and written on foolscap paper bookwise.

4. These six days to be appropriated among the LONDON AGENTS, in the following order:—The letters refer to the initial of the AGENT's surname, or that of the senior partner in the case of a firm.

Those commencing with—

A or B	Nov. 20
C, D, E, or F	" 21
G, H, I, or J	" 22
K, L, M, N, O, or P	" 23
Q, R, or S	" 25
T, U, V, W, X, Y, or Z	" 26

5. On every day subsequent to November 26th, the certificates will be delivered to the rest of the profession.

6. The fee of 5s., for issuing each certificate, is to be paid on delivery of the same.

Mr. Bagshawe, Q.C., for many years past of the Chancery Bar, and who did a large business as a junior counsel, has been appointed Judge of the County Court of Cardiganshire, Circuit number 31. The appointment is a very good one, and highly creditable to the County Court Bench, since Mr. Bagshawe has been long known as an able and accomplished lawyer.

THE LAW OF BLOCKADE—ITS ORIGIN, NATURE, AND INCIDENTS. NO. I.

The law of blockade is a corollary to the more general international laws that relate to belligerent rights. As soon as a state of war was considered capable of being regulated by certain rules, and subject to them, the law of blockade could not fail to be soon developed. Belligerents could not, of course, have desired to interfere with the ordinary privileges of the subjects of those nations with whom they continued at peace; nor would these have succumbed to every demand that could be put forward by belligerents upon plausible grounds. The line should be drawn somewhere; and the principle of the restraints imposed upon neutrals is, that the restriction in all such cases is indispensable to render the operations of the belligerents effective or operative in their full natural force. Such being the origin and foundation of belligerent rights against neutrals, it should be carefully remembered; for the same necessity which originally introduced restraints upon neutral commerce continues to be the guiding rule for determining all doubtful cases in their relations to the belligerent branch of the international code. It cannot be necessary formally to prove that a blockade by a belligerent would be futile, if neutrals were allowed to maintain a communication with the place blockaded. As it is impossible for the besieging force to know what articles the besieged most require, the international law that we are now discussing forbids traffic of every kind, and all intercourse with the inhabitants of the place invested; (Bynkershoek Quest. Jur. Pub. Lib. 1, cap. 2). It is only the class of articles termed contraband of war that a belligerent can seize upon the high seas; but the law of blockade applies alike to articles of every description. This law, it thus appears, was necessarily coeval with the first rise of a belligerent code. Indeed, it is implied in it; and the actual records of contests between civilised states prove that it has been always considered to be of the highest importance.

Many writers deny that international law is entitled to the rank of a positive code, inasmuch as, if one nation violates the rights of another, there is no superior who may decide between them. Thus, Mr. Austin, in his celebrated work,* considers that an international rule is merely a law set by opinion and enforced by moral sanctions only. We do not propose formally to refute this proposition, which is contradicted by innumerable decisions in courts of Admiralty. It is also opposed to the theory of the balance of power, or rather denies that such a balance was ever contemplated by statesmen. But the foundation of this erroneous statement is to be found in the fact that international law more nearly corresponds with natural law than municipal codes do; that it is

* "The Province of Jurisprudence Determined," p. 208."

more directly derived from natural and moral principles; and that whenever precedent is silent, first principles and analogy are usually invoked to solve the difficulty. But municipal law is generally so copious in its positive provisions that there is not much room left for arguments founded upon theoretical or moral considerations. Although international law has thus, in all its branches, the nature rather of a deductive and rational science than that of a positive code, nevertheless, it is as strictly enforced as if all its rules were settled by treaty. International law is usually divided into two branches—natural or necessary law, and positive or instituted law. Other writers consider custom to be the sole foundation of the international code. For our part, we consider it to be entirely deducible from first principles, and that if the reason of a certain international rule be not apparent upon first consideration, it is because we do not always readily take into account all the circumstances which led to its establishment. Nations are properly described by Vattel as so many free persons in a state of nature. The natural rules of justice and veracity are equally as applicable to nations as to individuals. But as the municipal code does not enforce imperfect rights, so neither does international law enforce the observance of similar obligations. The portion of natural law that is enforced by the international code is found to be defined not so much by the importance of the precepts as by custom. There is thus no practical difference between the writers who rest the obligation of international law on natural morality, and those who derive it solely from usage. Whatever may be said of the origin of an international law, it has no place in international jurisprudence, until it has been sanctioned by custom evidenced by decided cases or by express treaty. The origin of an international rule, however, is important as regards its interpretation and the classes of persons to whom it is to be considered as applicable. Thus, belligerent rights, such as the law of blockade, which have never been questioned, would, doubtless, be more strictly enforced by courts of Admiralty than those which have been the growth of modern customs. Prior to the Paris Congress of 1856, Mahometans were not considered to be bound by the customary law of nations. But Lord Stowell held, in *The Hurler*, 3 Rob. 324, that they were bound by the natural branch of the international code, and, as a consequence, were liable to the usual penalties for having committed a breach of blockade.

A blockade may be defined to be the forcible prevention by a belligerent of all commercial intercourse on the part of neutrals with the enemy; and the law of blockade is that branch of the international code which regulates the conditions to which a blockade should conform, and which also prescribes the jurisdiction and procedure appropriate to the investigation of breaches, and the penalties attached to the same. "There are two sorts of blockade," says Lord Stowell, "one by the simple fact only, the other by a notification accompanied with the fact;" *The Neptunus*, 1 Rob. 171. As to the former, when the actual blockade ceases, the virtual blockade is likewise at an end; but in cases of the second class, as the blockade is proclaimed by a public notification, so likewise it should be put an end to in a similarly public manner. This is reasonable enough. *Nihil est enim magis conveniens naturali equitati quam unum-quodque ligamen eo dissolvi quo ligatum est.* But a blockade," says Bynkershoek, "is virtually relaxed *si signis ore observate sint.*" A blockade of the second class, it thus appears, may be put an end to by a cessation or long interruption of the blockade. The intermission of the belligerent's vigilance, however, must be of some long duration to warrant a presumption that the blockade is relinquished in cases in which it has been notified by proclamation. It is important to bear in mind that a blockade may take place by the simple fact only. This international rule generally

precludes any demurrer founded upon the allegation of an alleged insufficiency of power on the part of the person proclaiming or making the blockade, because the supreme authority in the belligerent state may adopt a blockade, just as if it had been originally authorised by it: *Omnis rati habitio retrotrahitur et mandato priori æquiparatur.* The object of a blockade being to cut off all commercial communication with the blockaded port, an act of egress is, *ceteris paribus*, as culpable as an act of ingress. A ship coming out of a blockaded port is, in the first instance, liable to seizure; the onus of proving the innocence of intention on the part of the party who has *prima facie* so committed a breach of blockade resting upon him (Bynk. Q. J. Pub. tit. 1, c. 4; *The Fredericke Molke*, 1 Rob. Rep. 72; *The Neptunus*, 1 Rob. Rep. 144; *The Vrouw Judith*, 1 Rob. Rep. 126). A breach of this law is also very severely punished. Vattel, however, is hardly warranted in stating,* as he does, that the offending party may be treated as an enemy. The jurisdiction and remedies available for the punishment of breaches of blockade will form the subject of a separate article. We will only here observe, in respect to this point, that the violation of blockade by the master affects, as a general rule, the ship only, and not the cargo, unless a direct knowledge of the intended breach be proved to have existed on the part of the owner (*The Mercurius*, 1 Rob. 80). Although the law of blockade is severe, nevertheless the usual immunity of the cargo is a temptation to owners to introduce their goods into the blockaded port, which is likely to give a price for them considerably beyond the ordinary rate and the value of the risk.

"On the question of a blockade," says Lord Stowell, in *The Betsey*, 1 Rob. 92, "three things must be proved. 1st, the existence of an actual blockade; 2nd, the knowledge of the party; and 3rd, some act of violation." As regards the last point, the time of shipment is material. After the commencement of a blockade a neutral is not allowed to purchase anything in the blockaded port; but he may retire with a cargo if it be already laden.

The United States Government have been always remarkable for their persevering efforts to disengage neutral commerce from the thralldom in which it has been held by the settled belligerent code. That Government, however, did not subscribe the Paris manifesto of 1856, the fourth clause of which provides that blockades, to be legal, must be effective. The States are, therefore, only bound by the common law rule of nations as to questions relating to the effectiveness of a blockade. But with regard to the time of shipment, it appears from a letter published in the *Times* of the 28th October, by the solicitors for the ship *Hiawatha*, upon the Admiralty case relating to which we shall presently offer a few comments, that the Government of the United States have waived all right to found any belligerent claim in respect of the time of shipment. The substance of the ordinance in question is given in the letter mentioned in the form of an extract from a letter written by Lord Lyons, our minister at Washington, to Mr. Moore, the British consul at Richmond. The rule is thus stated to be, that "Neutral vessels will be allowed fifteen days to leave port after the actual commencement of the blockade, whether such vessels are with or without cargoes, and whether the cargoes were shipped before or after the commencement of the blockade." The owners of the ship *Hiawatha* had been cautioned by Mr. Moore that the ship could legally depart only in ballast. The master, being dissatisfied with this announcement, addressed himself to Lord Lyons, from whom Mr. Moore received the foregoing notification. The owners then tried to run the blockade with a cargo; but the ship was seized and libelled as prize in the Admiralty Court. The owners have set up

six grounds of defence. These are as follows:—A denial of notice of the blockade; a denial of the existence of a state of war adequate to support the claim of the captor; a denial of the existence of a State of blockade; a denial that states of the Union are enemies within the meaning of that term as understood in international jurisprudence; and a denial of the power of the president to declare war or proclaim a blockade without the consent of Congress. These grounds of defence may be ranged under three general heads—a general demurrer; a traverse of the fact of blockade; and a traverse of the allegation of notice.

Two very unusual questions are raised in these pleas—first, the power of the President to proclaim a blockade, even assuming that the state of facts would warrant such an intervention by the executive head of the United States; second, the existence of a proper state of facts whereon to found a blockade. Although the *Times* of the 24th of October, in a leading article upon the case of *The Hiawatha*, appears to consider the negative of these positions as tenable, we confess that we are of a very different opinion. It is an adventurous plea that implicitly denies that the United States have, or ever had, a competent executive. As Congress is not always in session, unless the President is the person who is to superintend the execution of the laws of the United States, we shall look in vain for a permanent representative of the sovereignty of the States. Furthermore, the President is bound by his oath of office to "preserve, protect, and defend the constitution." Incidental to this is, doubtless, the right of proclaiming a blockade upon a fitting occasion. At all events, Congress may adopt and so ratify the act of the President. As to the second constitutional objection—that the Southern States are not enemies in the sense in which the term is juristically understood, as they are not recognised as belligerents by the United States, we consider that British subjects are estopped from controverting that fact since our own Government have by a public notification admitted the contrary. If the owners of *The Hiawatha* allege that they have aided rebels and not belligerents; such a plea, if held valid, would doubtless overthrow the jurisdiction of the Admiralty Court; but the second branch of the dilemma would not be very profitable to them, inasmuch as by aiding rebels they were guilty of a still greater offence than a violation of an international rule, which is certainly not punishable capitally. We consider that the defence made by the owners of *The Hiawatha*, so far as it is based upon loopholes in the constitution of the United States, is visionary, and that the apparent encouragement given to such defences by our great cotemporary is not unlikely to have a mischievous effect. But such of the questions raised in the defence mentioned as are founded upon the common law of nations as declared by the decisions of admiralty courts, offer a more interesting and important field for investigation. It will be the object of the subsequent papers which we shall give on the law of blockade to elucidate this branch of the international code by reference to decided cases, and to show what constitutes an effective blockade; what is a breach thereof; and what are the jurisdiction and remedies appropriate to the punishment of such breaches.

The Courts, Appointments, Promotions, Vacancies, &c.

COURT OF BANKRUPTCY.

(Before Mr. Commissioner HOLROYD.)

Oct. 26.—In re Denny.—This bankrupt, having petitioned under the new Act, against himself, had obtained an adjudication. He subsequently filed his statement of debts and liabilities, pursuant to the 93rd section of the Act, and the fourth rule, and he now applied for his discharge from custody. The application was opposed on behalf of a detaining cre-

ditor. It appeared that on the 15th of June last the bankrupt filed his petition in the Insolvent Debtor's Court, pursuant to the 1 & 2 Vict. c. 110; and on the 24th of June an order was made vesting his property in the provisional assignee; and a question was raised whether the Court would, by discharging the bankrupt, adopt the proceedings in this court.

The COMMISSIONER asked the bankrupt why he did not file his schedule in the Insolvent Debtor's Court.

The bankrupt said the petition to that Court was filed without his authority, and he had not sufficient means to continue the proceedings.

The COMMISSIONER said he would speak to Mr. Commissioner Evans before coming to any decision.

Oct. 29.—His Honour said he had spoken to Commissioner Evans, and he agreed with him in opinion that the bankrupt had no *locus standi* in this court until the petition in the other court was in some way disposed of. He referred particularly to the 24th section of the Bankruptcy Act, 1861, providing for the setting and winding-up of all petitions, matters, and things presented to or depending in the said court.

The application was accordingly refused.

Oct. 28.—In a case from Hereford, which came before his Honour to-day, he decided that upon the true construction of the 88th and 89th sections of the Bankruptcy Act of 1861, it was not competent for this Court, in a case where the debts are below £300, and where the debtor resides or carries on business beyond 20 miles from the General Post Office, to direct that the petition be prosecuted in this court.

In re J. Owen Clarke.—In this case it appeared that the bankrupt had failed to comply with the 93rd section of the Bankruptcy Act, 1861, and the fourth Order, which requires a bankrupt to file a list of his creditors within three days of adjudication. It was asked that the accounts should be filed *nunc pro tunc*.

HIS HONOUR said he could not allow this, as it might be made a precedent. The petition was dismissed.

(Before Mr. Commissioner GOULBURN.)

Oct. 28.—Re a trader debtor summons.—Mr. Commissioner GOULBURN held in this case that in a trader debtor summons where the debt and costs in the action are paid, but before the petition in bankruptcy is presented, the Court has no power to award costs unless the application for costs be made upon the return of the summons.

The particulars of demand, and a writ of summons were served on or about the same day. The summons in bankruptcy was served on the 18th instant, and was returnable on the 24th instant. The defendant paid the debt and costs in the action on the day the summons was returnable, but refused to pay the costs consequent upon the proceedings in bankruptcy.

The plaintiff applied to the Court for the costs of these proceedings.

Mr. Bannister (solicitor), for the summoning creditor, asked for the costs of the proceedings in bankruptcy under the 83th section of the Bankrupt Law Consolidation Act, 1849. The defendant did not take any notice of the proceedings in bankruptcy, and, consequently, committed a contempt of court. The Court had power to award costs under the 85th section of the Bankrupt Law Consolidation Act, 1849, and the 213th section of the Bankruptcy Act, 1861. He cited *Webb v. Hewitt*, 6 Exch. 105.

Mr. Perrin (solicitor), for the defendant, contended that the application for costs was made too late. If the plaintiff was entitled to costs at all, he should have applied for them on the return of the summons. He also submitted that the Court had no power to award costs, there being no creditor before the Court, and the costs in the action were taxed without any reference to the bankruptcy costs.

Mr. Commissioner GOULBURN decided that the plaintiff was not entitled to the costs of the bankruptcy proceedings, and held that he was too late in his application. If the plaintiff were entitled to costs at all, he should have applied for them on the day that the summons was returnable, and he might then have given costs under the 213 section of 24 & 25 Vict. c. 134.

Application refused.

Oct. 31.—In re —.—In this case the debtor petitioned in *forma pauperis*.

The attention of the Court was called to the 26th section of the New Bankruptcy Act, with a view to the debtor being ex-

ceased payment of the gaoler's fees for bringing him to this Court, and also advertisement charges incidental to bankruptcy. The section sets forth that, "All moneys and Government securities which shall, at the commencement of this Act, stand in the Bank of England to the credit of the account of the Commissioners of the Court for the relief of Insolvent Debtors in England shall be carried to the account of the Accountant in Bankruptcy;" and "shall be applicable as at present, or in such manner as the Lord Chancellor shall by order direct, towards defraying the salaries of the clerks and other persons hereby transferred from the Insolvent Court to the Court of Bankruptcy, and towards defraying the expenses of, and incidental to, the discharge of pauper prisoners hereinafter provided," &c.

The fund referred to in the Bank of England is of small amount.

His HONOUR said that no order had yet been made by the Lord Chancellor pursuant to the above section. The gaoler's fee and the fees out of the messenger's pocket must be paid.

INSOLVENT DEBTORS' COURT.

(Before the CHIEF COMMISSIONER.)

Oct. 31.—*In re William Squires*.—In this case, which was heard and adjudicated upon at Lancaster some months since, an application was made for the appointment of an assignee.

The CHIEF COMMISSIONER asked what power he had to make any appointment.

It was stated that the application could only be made to this Court, upon the ground that it was a matter pending on the 1st of October, when the new Bankruptcy Act came into force.

The CHIEF COMMISSIONER stated that his view of "pending business," which alone this Court had been directed by the Lord Chancellor to dispose of, did not include cases which had been finally adjudicated before the 12th of October. If that were not so the 250 cases which had been disposed of by the Court during the period of its existence might be regarded as pending business, and as applications respecting property might be made after any lapse of years, this Court would live for ever.

The Lord Chancellor has appointed Henry Ridgard Bagshawe, Esq., Q.C., to be judge of the county court of Cardiganshire, Circuit No. 31, in the place of John Johns, Esq., recorder of Carmarthen, who has resigned the office.

Recent Decisions.

COMMON LAW.

REAL ACTION UNDER COMMON LAW PROCEDURE ACT, 1860—DOWER, PLEAS IN.

Woodward v. Dodds, C. P., 9 W. R. 870.

This case is noticeable as being the first real action which has occurred, or, at least, been reported, since the changes introduced in that class of actions by the Common Law Procedure Act, 1860. The previous Common Law Procedure Acts did not expressly refer in any of their clauses to real actions; while, on the other hand, by far the larger portion of their provisions were expressly confined to *personal* actions. The Court of Common Pleas, however, held (in *Marshall v. Bishop of Exeter*, 6 C. B. N. S. 716), that two of the clauses of the Act of 1852 (ss. 81, 22, which regulate the practice as to pleading double) did apply to real actions; but the main features which used to distinguish these from personal actions, such as the commencement by *original* instead of by writ of summons, were admitted to remain as before; and this being inconvenient, as causing an unnecessary deviation with regard to the actions of dower and *quare impedit*, from the ordinary course of common law proceedings, clauses were introduced into the Procedure Act of 1860, which were intended to obliterate any distinction between real and personal actions, either as regards the writ by which they are commenced or the manner in which they are carried on. The sections on this head of the 23 & 24 Vict. c. 126, are the 26th and 27th, which, in substance, provide that whenever the proper remedy is an "action of dower" or "*quare impedit*," an action may be commenced in the *Common Pleas* by an ordinary writ of summons, on which is to be endorsed a notice that the plaintiff intends to declare in dower or *quare impedit*, as the case may

be; and that the subsequent proceedings (including costs) on such writ shall be subject to the same rules and practice, as nearly as may be, as the proceedings in personal actions.

The present case is a useful reading upon these provisions, and shows that it was not thereby intended to change in any respect the *law* of real actions as distinct from the manner of using the remedy; for it is one of the ancient pleas (given by 13 Ed. 1) to an action of dower—that is to say, an action brought by the widow (usually as against the heir or devisee) to recover her thirds of the lands and tenements of which her late husband was seised in fee or in tail, at some time during the coverture, and of which her issue might have been heir—that the plaintiff eloped from her husband and lived in adultery with another person (see *Hetherington v. Graham*, 6 Bing. 135); and a plea to this effect was accordingly relied on in the present case; but the plaintiff sought to reply to it by alleging that she had been forced to leave her husband by reason of cruelty such as would entitle her to a judicial separation in the new Divorce Court; and if this replication had been held valid it would have overturned the ancient law of dower. But the Court said that the whole question still turned upon the construction of the Statute of Westminster the second, which allowed the plea; and that under it, though a wife is not barred of her dower merely by leaving her husband (as she may do if cruelly treated), she cannot both leave him and commit adultery without the penalty of the statute attaching; and they therefore gave judgment on the demurrer for the defendant. It may be useful here to recapitulate the most usual pleas in this action, as it is (from this case) clear that they are still available. These are—1, the plea of adultery; 2, the plea, that the plaintiff and her supposed husband were never joined in lawful matrimony; and 3, the plea, that from the death of the husband, the defendant has always been, and still is, ready to render the widow the lands and tenements in question.

EFFECT OF DECREE NISI FOR DISSOLUTION OF MARRIAGE—INTERPLEADER ISSUE.

Shingler v. Holt, Ex., 9 W. R. 871.

This case raises but does not decide a point as to the *status* of a woman whose marriage has been dissolved, as it exists between the date of the decree *nisi* and the decree absolute for such dissolution. An interpleader issue had been ordered to try whether certain goods seized in execution were, on the day of seizure, the goods of the execution debtor or of another claimant. The goods in question had been seized in the house of the execution debtor; but were claimed by a female who lived in the same house, and whose title was established, subject to the question, whether, as she was still a married woman, (though a decree *nisi* for the dissolution of her marriage had been obtained), the goods in question did not rather belong to her husband. The case was decided on the principle that it is not competent for an execution creditor to set up a *ius tertii* to defeat the claimant's title, if against the execution creditor such title is good; but the Court refused to entertain the question of *status* pending the decree for dissolution becoming absolute—observing that the proper manner of obtaining relief on any ground arising from the husband's possible interest in the goods, would have been by an application to the judge, by whom the issue was directed, to compel the husband to become a party to the issue.

LAW OF LIGHTS—RIGHT ACQUIRED UNDER 2 & 3 WILL. 4, c. 71—ALTERATION OF WINDOWS.

Hutchinson v. Copestake, Exch. C., 9 W. R. 896.

Out of this case, the special facts of which could scarcely be made intelligible without the aid of plans, a useful general principle may be deduced with regard to the right to the "access or use of light to and for any building;" the uninterrupted enjoyment of which for twenty years constitutes, under 2 & 3 Will. 4, c. 71 an absolute and indefeasible right to it. For the judgment shows that an action for obstructing such light is not maintainable, if the plaintiff by his own act confuses the *indicia* of the light in question and of the extent of its enjoyment. The plaintiff, having a house with certain windows therein, more than twenty years before the obstruction complained of, pulled it down and rebuilt it with other windows; which, though the same in number and general position, did not occupy precisely the same sites as the previous ones. The defendants afterwards erected a building which partially obstructed the due access of light to the plaintiff's house so rebuilt; but the Court of Common Pleas decided that, under the circumstances, the plaintiff had acquired no right to light under the Prescription Act; and the Court of

Exchequer Chamber unanimously confirmed the judgment. The judgment of this last Court proceeded chiefly on the authority of the case of *Renshaw v. Bean*, 18 Q. B. 112, which established that an alteration in a window will destroy the right to light therefrom previously acquired, unless the new window is *substantially* the same as the old one; while in the present instance it was otherwise.

Correspondence.

STATUTE LAW REVISION.

From the letter in your last week's impression, signed "Francis S. Reilly and Arthur John Wood," I presume that those gentlemen prepared the 24 & 25 Vict. c. 101, and though they cannot, of course, remove the responsibility of that Act from their employers, yet, in consequence of such avowal, they render themselves liable to be reproached for any slip which may have been committed therein.

Now, with all due deference to the compilers of that statute, I am still of opinion that it would have been better to have left the 6 & 7 Will. 4, c. 101, s. 3, alone; and to establish this I conceive it to be only necessary to show that its repeal may occasion a *doubt* even as to what the law now is.

As to the first branch of my objection (to adopt Messrs. Reilly and Wood's own analysis of my note) the 6 & 7 Vict. c. 18, may be altogether left out of the question, as it does not in any way refer to the 6 & 7 Will. 4, c. 101, s. 3, and as this last enactment is treated by the subsequent statute, 17 & 18 Vict. c. 57, as being then in full force and operation.

"But" (say Messrs. Reilly and Wood) "it is plain that the first part of 6 & 7 Will. 4, c. 101, s. 3, is over-ridden by 17 & 18 Vict. c. 57, for the first enactment provides in effect that in the case of a vacancy in the office of a returning officer for a borough the sheriff of the county shall appoint a deputy to perform the duties; while the second enactment provides in effect that in all cases whatever, whenever there shall be, either from temporary vacancy or from some other cause, no person legally qualified to perform the duties of returning officer, the sheriff of the county shall in all respects perform the duties of and incidental to the office of returning officer."

Now, in my opinion, the effect of these two enactments is not here fairly stated, but should rather have been as follows:—

The first part of the first enactment (6 & 7 Will. 4, c. 101, s. 3) provides "in effect" that if there shall happen to be any vacancy in the office of returning officer for a borough during the time when certain acts with regard either to the execution of an election writ or to the registration of voters, are required by law to be done, the sheriff may appoint a person to perform such acts. And the second enactment (17 & 18 Vict. c. 57) "in effect" provides in reference to the duties of the returning officer *with regard to the election writ* that where there is no returning officer qualified to perform any of such duties, they shall be performed by the sheriff. Now, if the above is an accurate account of these two enactments (and I invite your readers to examine for themselves whether it be so or not) it is clear that the 17 & 18 Vict. c. 57, has nothing whatever to do with the registration duties of the returning officer as the substitute in certain cases for the town clerk. Indeed (as appears from the preamble to that Act itself) it was passed to remedy a difficulty occasioned by a change in the direction of the election writ by 16 & 17 Vict. c. 68, and no mention whatever is made in it of the 6 & 7 Vict. c. 18, which contained the then as now existing law with regard to registration of voters. Moreover, Messrs. Reilly and Wood themselves say that "by 17 & 18 Vict. c. 57, the sheriff of the county is in terms charged with the execution of a writ for the election of a member of Parliament for the borough" where there is "no returning officer to execute the same." Not a word here about his being by this Act charged with the duties of the returning officer as the substitute of the town clerk in registration matters.

But if this be so, then what becomes of the second branch of my objection—viz., that the repeal of 6 & 7 Vict. c. 101, s. 3, might possibly occasion a practical difficulty? Suppose there happened in the month of July, when the town clerk has different registration matters to attend to, to be a vacancy from death or otherwise in the office of the relieving officer of some borough, where (as for example, at *Taunton*) he is the person to attend to such matters, there being no town clerk or other officer executing such duties as usually devolves on the town clerk. The 17 & 18 Vict. c. 57, as I have already shown, refers only to the substitution of the sheriff for the relieving

officer *with regard to the election writ*, and therefore now that Messrs. Reilly and Wood have repealed the provision for this contingency which was previously in force, what is to be done?

One word more and I will conclude this defence of the validity—or, at all events, the reasonableness, of my objection. I am content to rest it by an appeal to the candour of those gentlemen. At the time they repealed section 3 did they or did they not notice the difference between it and the subsequent provision in 17 & 18 Vict. c. 57—or rather had they the Registration Act in their minds? Were they not (as perhaps was natural) satisfied by observing that two of the sections of 6 & 7 Will. 4, c. 101, were temporary only, while the 3rd was referred to, and in part re-enacted, without being repealed by 17 & 18 Vict. c. 57? If they committed this error the only advice I would venture to give them in consequence, is to weigh still more deeply than, I doubt not, they already do, the extreme difficulty and delicacy of their task, more especially when they deal with the enactments of our own times.

The Temple, Oct. 29, 1861.

JAMES STEPHEN.

ANDERSON v. ELSWORTH.

I have perused your report and opinion on this case as contained in the *Solicitors' Journal* of the 19th instant,* and take leave to state that when I took the instructions for the conveyance from Mrs. Marston I fully explained to her the difference between a deed and a will, after which she gave me instructions to prepare the deed in order to make a final settlement of her affairs, and to put Mrs. Elsworth into the immediate possession as absolute owner of the property. I then fully explained to her that a deed so prepared would leave her solely dependant upon Mrs. Elsworth for her future maintenance; in answer to which she expressed her full reliance upon Mrs. Elsworth for her future support. When she afterwards came to my office to execute the deed I again cautioned her, before she executed it, that she was thereby parting with all her interest absolutely to Mrs. Elsworth, without any provision for her future maintenance; and that if she signed the same she could not afterwards revoke the deed. She appeared vexed at my repetition of such cautions, and informed me that she had come expressly to execute the conveyance of the property to Mrs. Elsworth; that she did not wish to have any power to revoke the deed in any manner, as she wished Mrs. Elsworth to become owner of the property immediately; and several times inquired if I had made it perfectly safe to her, and stated herself satisfied that Mrs. Elsworth would provide for her during her life. I explained all this in my instructions for preparing the affidavit to Mr. Bacon, and on the hearing, when Mr. Malins stated that I had allowed Mrs. Marston to leave my office a penniless pauper without caution, I then explained to him that what he was stating to the Court was contrary to the truth, as I had acted quite the reverse. I also offered myself as a witness to Mr. Bacon, to explain and contradict such misstatements, which he declined to act upon.

Under these circumstances I feel myself professionally injured, and am apprehensive that the Vice-Chancellor, for want of a more perfect explanation, and under a misconception of the real facts, determined this case as he did, when, in fact, judgment ought to have been given for the defendants.

Knaresborough, Oct. 26, 1861.

P. TAYLOR.

RAILWAY LIABILITIES.

In reply to the inquiry of "J. T. S." I think it is only necessary to refer him to the following quotation from "The Law of Carriers of Goods and Passengers":—"Where railway companies hold themselves out as carriers, and receive goods to be carried to places beyond the limits of their own line, and even beyond the realm, they are responsible for a loss of, or injury to the goods, although the same may not have happened on their own line of railway;" and the reports of *Muschamp v. Lancaster and Preston Junction Railway Company*, 8 M. & W. 421; and *Watson v. Ambergate, Nottingham, and Boston Railway Company*, 15 Jur. 448.

AN ARTICLED CLERK.

The law is now well settled, that where a railway company receives goods for carriage beyond the limits of its own line, and the goods are forwarded by other companies to their destination, the contract to carry is with the first company, and the other companies are their agents only to complete the contract. It follows, in the case put by "J. T. S." in your last

* See ante, p. 810.

number, p. 819, the remedy must be pursued against the C. company, although in fact the damage may have happened on S. D. or N. D. line. The cases which establish this are *Crouch v. The Great Western Railway Company*, 26 L. J. N. S. Ex. 418; a. c. in Ex. Ch. 6 W. R. 391; *Collins v. Bristol and Exeter Railway Company*, in House of Lords, 29 L. J. N. S. Ex. 41; *Coxon v. Great Western Railway Company*, 29 L. J. N. S. Ex. 865. Before suing C. company it will be necessary to examine the terms of the contract note, which is usually signed by the consignor of goods, and see that it contains no special condition limiting the company's liability to their own line of railway. If there be such a condition it is difficult to see what remedy the consignor has. The first company would be relieved by their special contract; and with the other companies the cases show there is no contract. This was the state of things in *Coxon v. Great Western Railway Company*, which called forth the following remark from Bramwell, B., in his judgment in that case:—"It is certainly a very inconvenient thing that persons should be met with such a defence as this, if they have a good cause of action at all; and it might not be wise to provide, by an Act of Parliament, that where a right of action exists under similar circumstances, either of the railway companies might be sued, leaving the companies afterwards to adjust the matter among themselves."

In *Mytton v. The Midland Railway Company*, 28 L. J. N. S. Ex. 385, it was suggested by Martin, B., that the railway company which first receives the goods might be looked upon as contracting as principals for the carriage on its own line, and beyond its limits as agents for undisclosed principals, so as to give the consignor a right of action against the company on whose line the damage happens; but the Court repudiated that view on the ground of there being but one contract, which could not be split up into several. As companies have the power, by the introduction of a special condition into the contract note, of defeating claims for compensation when the damage does not occur on their line, the law on this head cannot be regarded as on a very satisfactory footing; and until some such legislative enactment is made as suggested by Bramwell, B., cases will probably arise in which the principles which now govern the courts may work injuriously. B.

Your correspondent "J. T. S." does not mention any express contract on the part of the C. line of rail limiting its liability to damage occurring on its own line. Had there been such express contract, on the authority of *Fowles v. The Great Western Railway Company*, 22 L. J. Exch. 76, the C. line would have been exempt from any damage proved to have been sustained beyond its limits. Otherwise, as decided in *Muschamp v. The Lancaster and Preston Railway Company*, 8 M. & W. 421, and many other cases, the C. line are liable up to the door of the address to which the goods are destined. See "Addison on Wrongs," p. 320. A. J. D.

COMMON LAW JUDGES' CHAMBERS.

Can nothing be done to improve these bear-gardens? They must be as unpleasant to the judges as to the counsel, pleaders, attorneys, and their clerks. Why cannot the Masters hear all the applications for time to plead? I can bear witness that at present the system is insufferable. I would consent to almost anything sooner than go. Do pray cleanse this Augean stable, or try, at all events. The author of "Pickwick" exposed it years ago, and I should like to know what improvement there has been since. I witnessed last week something very like a personal combat between two learned counsel alike anxious to get before the judge.

A COMMON LAW CLERK.

The time occupied in attending summonses at chambers has long been a grievance. Why should not the Masters of the common law courts have a similar power to hear and adjudicate as is given to the registrars in bankruptcy by the Bankruptcy Act, 1861, sect. 52 and seq. J.

TRANSMISSION OF BANK NOTES BY POST.

The recent frauds committed by servants of the Post Office have suggested to me the expediency of some scheme for rendering the transmission of Bank of England notes secure from loss through the dishonesty of officials; this might easily be effected if Bank of England notes were allowed to be crossed in the same manner as cheques with the name of the banker of the payee. The adoption of this plan would also be of great service in other transactions in which payments by

money are required, and especially to solicitors, who often are under the necessity of carrying about with them large sums to complete purchases or for other purposes, and who in all such cases incur at present considerable risk from the accidents of loss or robbery. The plan I have indicated, would, I think, have the beneficial effect of providing a means of security from loss, and of diminishing what has been proved to be a fertile source of fraud; and I consequently venture to submit it to the consideration of your readers. J. C. T. S.

Review.

The Game Laws of the United Kingdom, comprising the whole of the Law on the Subject; with Introduction, Cases, Notes, and Index. By JAMES PATERSON, Esq., M.A., of the Middle Temple, Barrister-at-Law. London: Shaw & Sons. 1861

This work is, as it professes to be, a complete, as it is also a very interesting, work on the game laws of the United Kingdom. It is thus more extended in its applicability than the recently-published "Handy-book" of Mr. Oke, which treats only of the game laws of England. The introduction to the present work contains a lively disquisition upon the philosophy, as well as upon the policy, of the game laws. Mr. Paterson is an advocate of the plenary rights of property, and dissents from the report sought to be adopted by Mr. Bright, in 1845-6, when the question of the game laws was referred to a select committee of the House of Commons. The policy of the game laws, we think, commends itself to every one who will take the pains of distinguishing between the principle of those laws, and the numerous clumsy expedients by which they have been sought to be declared. A general consolidation of the Game Acts is the obvious remedy for the defects of the present state of this branch of law.

Mr. Paterson considers that the term "game" has received a statutory definition in the 1 & 2 Will. 4, c. 32, s. 2; so that only "hares, pheasants, partridges, grouse, heath or moor game, black game and bustards," are comprised in the word game. Mr. Oke* is of the same opinion. It appears to us, however, doubtful, whether the section of the Act mentioned is intended to give a complete and exclusive definition of the word. The 13th section of the 9 Geo. 4, c. 69, "The Night Poaching Act," contains a similar definition of the term game. That statute enacts, that the word game "shall be deemed to include" the species of birds that we have mentioned; but it does not exclude any others which may have been recognised as such either at common law or by statute. There is room, therefore, to contend, that, as regards civil actions, pigeons, deer, and rabbits, are likewise comprised in the term game, since they have been recognised as such by statute. The law of game being interwoven with the law of trespass, of which, indeed, apart from fiscal considerations, it constitutes a mere variety, Mr. Paterson has given (pp. 44-64) a very accurate, and even interesting, account of the law of trespass, both generally and in respect to the game laws; nor do we think that twenty pages of his work could be more appropriately applied. Mr. Oke is not, we think, sufficiently copious on the law of trespass. It is obvious that a sportsman should be informed not only as to what is game and what is not, but also as to the degree of restraint which he must impose upon himself and his canine attendant. Mr. Paterson shows that a dog may occasionally enter a close without rendering his master a trespasser; although his master could not do so with equal impunity. These, and other like pertinent bits of information which are interspersed throughout the work, we consider very useful in respect of the class for whom the work is especially intended.

The treatise before us gives an account of the game laws applicable to Ireland and Scotland, as well as of those applicable to England. Mr. Oke does not allude to the game laws of those countries, except once (p. 13), where he mentions their respective seasons of sporting. This is a great defect in his book, which is otherwise so comprehensive. The sportsman, therefore, who is possessed only of Mr. Oke's handy-book, will, if he intends proceeding into either of the sister kingdoms, require to be provided likewise with the still more complete treatise of Mr. Paterson. This suggestion is the more important as regards Scotland, lest the sportsman should find himself involved in a suit arising out of the Act "anent hunting and hawking," in reference perhaps to a deed of tailzie with irritant and resolute clauses, the irritant portion of which he might

* "Handy-book of the Game and Fishery Laws," p. 14.

be disposed to consider vastly to preponderate. Mr. Paterson gives the series of enactments in respect of game applicable to Scotland from the year 1621 down to the present time. He traces the Irish corresponding series, which commences as far back as the Act 13 Ric. 2, c. 130 (the Irish Qualification Act). The statutory law of game is, in substance, nearly the same for the United Kingdom. There are, however, points of difference sufficiently numerous between the respective game codes of the three kingdoms to involve an unwary sportsman in litigation. It appears that a property qualification is still necessary to entitle a person to pursue game either in Ireland or in Scotland. The period of close time, also, is not the same in the three kingdoms. The 6th section of the Irish Act, 27 Geo 3, c. 35 (the Irish Game Act), does not define game in the same terms as are used in the English Act, 1 & 2 Will. 4, c. 32, s. 2; while the 3rd section of the Scotch Act, 13 Geo. 3, c. 54, comprises snipes within the definition of the term game, and so far differs from the corresponding English and Irish Acts. The common law of Scotland, as regards the rights of landlord and tenant, is different from the corresponding branch of English law, and the law of trespass is different in each of the three kingdoms. It is to be regretted that Mr. Oke did not mention in his book that there were many other points of difference between the game codes of the three kingdoms than as regards the seasons, which alone he noticed. We now see that this omission is important, as it is apt to mislead the sportsman with the notion that the United Kingdom has, as it ought to have, a common game code, except as to the periods of the sporting seasons.

Mr. Paterson's treatise indicates a great familiarity with its subject on the part of the author. Its diction and style are very good, and if its tone is somewhat more lively than is usually to be observed in a legal treatise, we may set down this exuberance of animation to the exciting nature of the subject, which he appears to have pursued with the zest of a sportsman. Perhaps, he also desired to accommodate his work to the lively tastes of those for whom he has written. This treatise is, on the whole, a very creditable performance, and, while eminently adapted to suit the requirements of the sportsman, is, also, likely to be found equally useful to the practitioner. Its main defect is to one of method. It proceeds upon a basis of statutory fact, whereas its parts should be arranged in their natural, rather than in their logical, sequence. This is a great advantage possessed by Mr. Oke's Handy-book. The remarks which we offered upon this latter work (*ante* p. 738), shows that the game laws may be readily digested into a set treatise possessing a due collocation of its parts, and constructed with a sufficient regard to all the unities of a legal treatise. The work before us, on the other hand, after giving an introduction, which is speculative merely, and has more of a political than of a juristic character, gives a bold collection of statutes, with notes. These statutes are arranged in the order of their importance, and not according to their dates. If a preference is to be made of one injudicious method over another, the order or arrangement observed by Mr. Paterson is to be deemed better than if he ranged the statutes according to their priority of date. The method adopted by him, however, is apt to invert the rule which the practitioner should observe in order to ascertain the legal definition of a disputed term. This is, as a general rule, to be learned by reference to prior enactments on the same subject. An arrangement of the game statutes, therefore, according to their dates, is not without its advantage, which is to some extent lost by the method pursued in the treatise before us. This shows that an author should seldom attempt to construct his treatise upon a statutory basis, unless there be some leading consolidation statute, which renders such a proceeding safe. A piece-meal commentary upon statutes is apt to leave some of them unnoticed. This, we fear, is the case as regards the present treatise. Mr. Oke gives a voluminous list of statutes, to which he refers in his Handy-book. But Mr. Paterson treats only of twenty-two statutes altogether, five of which relate to Scotland and six to Ireland. Mr. Oke, indeed, has treated of the fishery laws, as well as of those relating to game. Nevertheless, we fear that Mr. Paterson's list does not exhaust the series of statutes relating to game. We do not think, however, that our author has omitted any point of game law of importance. He ought not to have omitted a survey of the fishery laws, which are so intimately connected with the laws relating to game, especially as the duties of an author on the fishery laws have been greatly facilitated by the recent Salmon Fishery Consolidation Act, 24 & 25 Vict. c. 109. Although the method of giving the game statutes with notes, as adopted in the treatise before us, is inferior to that of a work, the parts of which would be found

arranged in a regular order, such as obtains in Mr. Oke's Handy-book, nevertheless, the very good index, which Mr. Paterson's work possesses, tends, so far as the requirements of the practitioner are concerned, to neutralise any defect in point of method. The treatise before us contains a still greater number of cases than are to be found in Mr. Oke's Handy-book. This superiority of Mr. Paterson's work, however, may be referable to the fact that his treatise is intended to describe the game code of the whole United Kingdom.

The Criminal Law Consolidation Statutes of 24 & 25 Vict. cap. 94 to 100, edited with notes, critical and explanatory. By JAMES EDWARD DAVIS, Esq., of the Middle Temple, Barrister-at-law. London: Butterworth.

The six Criminal Law Consolidation Statutes of the last session, received the Royal assent on the 1st of August, and came into operation on the 1st of this month. The consolidation of the statutory laws, with which these Acts deal—namely, those relating to offences against the person; larceny and similar offences; malicious injuries to property; forgery; coining; and accessories, although far from complete, embraces nearly the whole of the statute law upon those subjects, and a considerable portion of the criminal law of this country. It would, therefore, be unreasonable to expect that Mr. Davis's edition of these statutes, published within three months from the publication of the Acts themselves, and the production of his unassisted labour, should contain the same amount of information and practical utility as might be expected to be found in a work prepared and matured at leisure. In the edition before us the public are provided with the Acts themselves, in a convenient form, with an index; and by means of reference to the corresponding clauses of those statutes upon which the work of consolidation has proceeded, the professional man is furnished with a clue by means of which he may ascertain what the law in any analogous case was up to the passing of these Acts. The Acts are printed in the order in which they received the Royal assent, and an attempt has been made to distinguish by brackets those provisions which are introduced for the first time. It would, however, it is conceived, be unsafe for a practitioner to assume that the only alterations in the law made by these Acts are such as are made by the provisions marked as described; for in many instances, where no brackets occur, the subjoined note informs the reader that the section is *nearly verbatim*, or that it is *framed upon* one or more statutes; and, obviously under such circumstances new words must occur, the operation of which upon the construction of the clause it must be extremely difficult to foretell. These distinguishing marks, however, though they may not be placed with perfect accuracy, materially contribute to the value of the book. The book also contains a table of offences and an introduction. Of the explanatory notes, except so far as they contain references to other analogous Acts as above noticed, we cannot speak with satisfaction. No method appears to have been pursued in the manner in which the matter contained in them is introduced. Sometimes cases in illustration of the text of the section are inserted; and sometimes, though there is an equal necessity for the insertion of such illustrations, and equal facility for supplying them, the editor, either from indolence or caprice, entirely omits them. It is unreasonable, perhaps, to expect to find, in a work published as this is, a history of the multifarious laws digested by the Acts, or a complete compilation from reports and text-books, of the leading decisions with reference to analogous legislation, or a description of the evidence and procedure in relation to the offences provided against; but though full information upon these points might not have been expected, it is only reasonable to suppose that such a work as the present will systematically point out those channels wherein such information may be readily obtained. To have furnished references to such sources of information would have been an easy task, and would have added greatly to the practical utility of the book. It is a task, however, which Mr. Davis has not undertaken. With the exception, therefore, of the words on the title-page, "*with notes critical and explanatory*," the book neither contains any express promise that the task undertaken by its editor shall be performed in any particular manner, nor statement that it has been prepared for any definite purpose and no one who may be disappointed by its contents can complain that more has been promised by its editor than has been performed. In the introduction it is stated that the Acts are merely new editions of "Peel's Acts," introduced for the purpose not of consolidating the criminal law, but mainly to get rid of the perplexities

in which the punishment for the offences dealt with, was involved before these Acts became law; and to assimilate the law of England and Ireland. In this part of the book the editor, in drawing attention to the great difficulties in the way of the consolidation of the statute law, remarks upon the "disheartening spectacle" exhibited by the repealing Act of the session. It repeats, either wholly or in part, no less than 106 statutes; but the work of destruction is necessarily so incomplete, that the mangled remains of a very considerable portion of the Acts must still continue to encumber the statute book, and add to the complications of consolidation. Indeed, judging from the example furnished by these Acts, the complete consolidation of the criminal law is a very remote possibility, and the consolidation of the whole statute law utterly hopeless.

JUSTICE AND ITS MISCARRIAGES.

At the recent meeting of the Metropolitan and Provincial Law Association at Worcester, the following paper on this subject was read by JOHN TURNER, Esq:—

At the meeting of the Society at Newcastle, in October last year, I ventured to submit for your consideration a few facts illustrative of the miscarriages of justice under our present judicial systems, and the necessity which existed, and still exists, for appointing a minister of justice. In doing so I briefly alluded to the distrust of suitors arising from the want of uniformity in judicial decisions; to the evils of a system which permits the laws which regulate the rights of parties to vary, and be in conflict, according to the court in which the matter in dispute may chance to be heard; to the endless changes in the law, which render it impossible for mankind to regulate their dealings by any known principle or standard; to the imperfect nature of remedial statute laws passed, and constantly passing, through the efforts of over zealous and unskilful law reformers; and to the injury sustained by the public and the profession consequent thereon; to the evils arising from judicial appointments being given as the reward of political servitude, instead of eminent professional ability and spotless integrity of life and conduct; to the injustice evinced to the public interest and to the profession of attorneys and solicitors by the appointment of barristers as taxing masters in the superior courts; and by the appointment of barristers as solicitors to the public departments of the State; and also to the claim which the colonists in our colonial dependencies had upon the Sovereign and the Government to the enjoyment and protection of the laws of England in common with every British subject.

Omitted, however, to notice another evil, not of unfrequent occurrence, which arises when courts of justice assume to themselves the functions of legislators, and by judicial decision either unsettle or overturn existing law which has been recognised by a long series of decisions; or when, with more boldness, they satirise from the judgment seat the legislative acts of the country, and under professed inability to understand an Act of Parliament, or by professing to understand its provisions in a sense different from the real meaning, they decide contrary to the intention of the Legislature and practically annul the statute law of the land. Instances of this kind are probably within the memory of most of my hearers; and as it has been my endeavour to avoid reflecting upon any particular court, I abstain from more pointed reference to such decisions. It would, however, be a false delicacy on my part if, in resuming the consideration of the necessity for the appointment of a minister of justice, I were to abstain from noticing instances of miscarriage of justice in our colonies, to be found in reported cases which are open to every professional reader, the more especially as such cases affect the interest of members of the profession as attorneys. In referring to such cases I wish it to be distinctly understood that I impute no misconduct to colonial judges, and I presume that they acted and decided according to the best of their ability, but subject to those failings of erring humanity adverted to by Lord Brougham in his Lordship's judgment in *Cottle's Case* (2 House of Lords Cases, 667).

There are two classes of reported cases to which I desire to draw attention, the one relating to the power exercised by colonial governors to suspend or remove judges, and the other to the power of colonial courts to suspend and disbar barristers and attorneys, the functions of barrister and attorney being in some colonies united. The exercise of

this last-mentioned power is often arbitrary and productive of individual suffering and wrong, and tends to pervert the course of justice. Some of these cases appear to have originated in ill-feeling between a particular practitioner and the judge, the result of local disputes, newspaper reports, or political feelings.

In *Re Downie and Arrundell* (3 Moore's P. C. Ca. 414) two advocates were suspended by two orders of the Court at British Guiana for having, as counsel, been concerned in and advised the service of a petition upon the judge which had been presented to her Majesty, praying her Majesty to stay proceedings in an action brought by the judge in his own court against a newspaper proprietor for alleged libel, and that he might be interdicted from presiding at the trial or from proceeding in any manner directly or indirectly with the action. The alleged libel consisted in an allegation that the judge had been guilty of delays in postponing the sittings of the Roll Court, and keeping that court shut at his pleasure to the injury and prejudice of her Majesty's subjects in the colony. These orders of disbarment were, upon an appeal to the Queen in council, reversed.

In the case of the *Representatives of the Islands of Grenada and Sanderson* (6 Moore's P. C. Ca. 38), the judge fined two magistrates for taking depositions in the third instead of the first person. It appears from the report of this case that several charges were made against the chief justice, which were in substance as follows:—

First. Exhibiting habitually on the bench a harsh and offensive demeanour towards the bar, the magistracy, and the grand juries, and addressing them in intemperate and violent language, and using expressions unbecoming his dignity as a judge.

Second. Denying the co-ordinate and co-equal jurisdiction of the puisne judges as established by statute, and taking constant occasion to assume a superior and independent authority.

Third. Refusing to carry the statute law into effect, for which he was suspended, and only restored upon his undertaking to enforce it.

Fourth. Disbarring a barrister, without notice given to him, or any opportunity afforded him of justifying or defending himself.

Fifth. Ordering another barrister to be committed for one month to gaol for two high contempt—viz., first, for moving to have the previous order of disbarment rescinded, notice of which had been given to the chief justice; and, secondly, for insisting upon his right, as a barrister, to be heard when desired by the chief justice to sit down and keep silence, notwithstanding that the other judge of the court, who had a co-ordinate jurisdiction, objected to such order being made.

Sixth. Procuring from the governor of the island the suspension of Mr. Justice Wells, for rescinding the above-mentioned order of disbarment, a suspension which was revoked by her Majesty under the advice of the law officers of the Crown in England.

Seventh. Making, without the knowledge or concurrence of the puisne judges, two rules of court, by which the puisne judges were forbidden to transact any business at chambers, rules which were rescinded by order of her Majesty under the advice of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

Eighth. Sentencing, summarily and without trial, one Andrew Lambie, a witness for the defence on the trial of an indictment, to a month's imprisonment in gaol and a fine of £10 for alleged prevarication and falsehood, which fine was directed, by order of her Majesty's Secretary of State for the Colonial Department, to be repaid to him, and the remaining portion of the term of imprisonment remitted.

Ninth. At an adjourned session of the court, illegally and without trial, issuing a writ of attachment against John Ross McCombie, and imprisoning him for three months, and imposing a fine of £100 for advertising in a newspaper upon the committal of Andrew Lambie, an imprisonment which was likewise in great part suffered before it could be remitted by the governor, though the fine was, by his order, never demanded.

Tenth. Ordering, at the April sessions of the Court in 1839, one Daniel McLean, a prisoner on his trial for an assault, out of court during the examination of the witnesses for the defence, and confining him in one of the upper rooms of the same building, whereby he was precluded from questioning the witnesses either by himself or his counsel, and was otherwise prevented from assisting his counsel in his defence.

Eleventh. Fining two magistrates, in opposition to the

opinion of the puisne judges sitting with him, for having taken depositions in the third person instead of the first person.

The chief justice also presented a memorial, objecting to the matter being investigated.

Both memorials having been referred to the Privy Council, their lordships made the following report to her Majesty:—

"The Lords of the Committee, in obedience to your Majesty's order of reference, have taken the said petition into consideration, and having heard counsel on both sides, do this day agree humbly to report to your Majesty as their opinion, that in the course of the fourteen years during which the Chief Justice has held his office, several instances of intemperance, and in some cases of illegal, conduct appear to their lordships to have been established against him; but having regard to the length of time which has elapsed since all such acts, except one, have been committed without any allegation of misconduct on his part in the meantime, and considering that the last of such acts—viz., fining of two magistrates in the year 1844—appears to their lordships, though erroneous and improper to have been committed in the execution of what the chief justice thought his duty, the Lords of this Committee do not think that *sitting judicially* their lordships can say the chief justice ought to be removed."

In *Montague v. The Lieutenant-Governor of Van Dieman's Land* (6 Moore's P. C. Ca. 489), it appeared that the judge was deeply embarrassed, and that the local court over which he presided was the only court in which actions against him could be brought, and that an action brought against him in such court was decided not to be maintainable, and that no judgment could be obtained so long as he remained judge, so that the creditor was without remedy according to law as administered in the colony.

In *Smith v. The Justices of Sierra Leone* (3 Moore's P. C. Ca. 361) an attorney and advocate practising in the courts of the colony of Sierra Leone was fined, imprisoned, disbarred, and struck off the rolls for asserting, when applying for a new trial, that the judge had misdirected the jury, and declining to answer a question put to him as to the particular words used; and upon the Privy Council reversing the orders the Court again, upon his return to practice, made an order to disbar him upon another ground, which order was also reversed by the Privy Council upon appeal. (See 7 Moore's P. C. Ca. 174.)

In *Graham v. Lafitte* (3 Moore's P. C. Ca. 382) the Governor of St. Lucia illegally suspended a judge, and appointed another in his stead; and all the acts done by the Court, so illegally constituted, were void, and the consequences were most disastrous to the public. The Lords of the Privy Council, upon the facts being drawn to their attention, to prevent the hardship upon the suitors, made orders declaring valid the proceedings and judicial acts of the Court while so improperly constituted.

In *Coette v. The Queen* (8 Moore's P. C. Ca. 484) the Governor and Executive Council at Port Natal, by an order suspended from his office the recorder of the district of Natal for alleged misconduct in having permitted an affidavit to be reformed instead of rejecting it altogether, or treating it as a contempt of court. This order was rescinded by the Privy Council, who advised the Crown that the salary attached to the office should be paid to the recorder as if no order of suspension had been made.

As the remedy in these cases relating to barristers and attorneys is, by the indulgence of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council acting under statutable powers, to allow an appeal to the Queen in council, or by a reference from the colonial office to that tribunal to entertain a petition, and the costs of such a form of proceeding is very heavy, and attended with great delay, the appointment of a minister of justice appears necessary to whom an application could be made direct for relief, and the authority of such an officer is also required to mitigate the consequences of illegal removals of colonial judges.

In addition to these reported authorities my attention has been directed to the case of a judge in one of our principle colonies, who had been an ironmonger by trade in this country, and was adjudged a bankrupt. He had, however, political interest, and became a barrister, and was appointed a colonial judge. His decisions proved to be very unsatisfactory to the colonists over whom he was sent to preside, and they thought that the best remedy for the evils he caused was to petition the Home Government for his removal, which they did, and so far succeeded that two additional judges

were appointed, whose ability in the discharge of their duties and courteous demeanour removed further ground for complaint. Had there been a minister of justice responsible to the country for all judicial appointments, both at home and abroad, or if the benchers of the various inns of court had any voice in such appointments, it is not likely that a person who had been a bankrupt trader, unless possessing high legal attainments, would have been made a judge, and the complaints of the colonists would have been unnecessary.

The time allowed by the rules of this society for reading papers will not permit me to refer to other cases, nor is it desirable that I should do so, as it might create opposition instead of support to the creation of such an office as I have indicated.

At the meeting of the society last year, the question was asked whether a minister of justice, if appointed, should be a cabinet minister, and whether he should go out of office upon a change of administration, and what would be the extent of his authority. I think that such an office, if created should be filled by a cabinet minister possessing high legal attainments, and that he should go out of office on a change of administration.

There are serious objections to be considered before such an officer can be constituted.

Admitting that there are many grave evils under our present systems, it has been doubted whether the appointment of a minister of justice is the proper remedy. The very name is foreign to our country, and forcibly reminds us of the despotism of foreign courts and the assumed sovereign right which is said to exist in some foreign states under which the ordinary laws of the country may be suspended. A minister of justice in this country giving sanction to such a doctrine would be a fearful evil, and it is sufficient to say, that no such power is sought to be conferred, and in this land of freedom would never be tolerated. The office which I suggest, by whatever name it may be called, is one which should be filled by a cabinet minister having in the House of Lords equal judicial authority with the Lord Chancellor and taking rank after him, and by virtue of his office he should be a Deputy Speaker in the House of Lords. He should superintend the preparation of all laws affecting the administration of justice or the rights of property. He should investigate complaints of injustice from and superintend the administration of justice in the colonies, and on his recommendation the Crown should have authority to remove any judge for incompetency or judicial misconduct. He should be responsible for all legal appointments, and all officers in courts of justice and all consular agents should be appointed with his approbation, and such appointments should be declared to be a public trust, to be exercised solely for the benefit of the country, and not by way of patronage. The responsibility of appointing judges of the superior courts should still remain with the Crown upon the recommendation of the cabinet ministers. It should also be the duty of such an officer to watch and find a remedy for every application of the law involving dangerously erroneous principles.

To prevent political favoritism, I think that no direct power of appointment should be placed in the hands of a minister of justice, and that colonial judgeships should be made from persons approved of by the benchers of the inns of court.

It may be contended that all the duties which I have indicated as necessary to be performed by a minister of justice are already adequately provided for, and that the Lord Chancellor, the Attorney-General, and the Secretary of State for the Home Department, are the persons to perform such duties. If this be so I have already shown that many of their most important duties are neglected, and although it may be true that these three state officers to some extent perform the duties of a minister of justice, yet the division of labour is either so apportioned as to cause the neglect of such duties, or that they are so onerous as to render them impossible of performance without further assistance. The Lord Chancellor is supposed to be responsible for all legal appointments both at home and in the colonies, but I will venture to say from the high character of the judges who have held the office of Lord Chancellor, that they cannot be held responsible for colonial appointments; and I shall be greatly surprised to find that any of the judges whose decisions I have referred to received their appointment on the recommendation of the Lord Chancellor for the time being. It is impossible for any Lord Chancellor now to perform those varied duties which might, without public incon-

venience, have been and probably were performed in the reign of William III., and which at that period comprised all the duties necessary from a minister of justice. The total change in the population and circumstances of the country have so far increased the duties as to render a reconsideration of the best means of securing their adequate performance necessary, and, according to the best consideration I have been able to give to the subject, I think that a state department of justice should be formed, and that a minister of justice should be appointed.

THE REGISTRATION OF TRADE MARKS.

The following paper by ARTHUR RYLAND, Esq., Solicitor Birmingham, was also read at the recent meeting of the Metropolitan and Provincial Law Association at Worcester:—

The piracy of trade marks, which was taken up by the Government during the last session, as one of the subjects on which Parliament ought to legislate, but which the Government failed in their efforts to deal with, will, if the intentions expressed by them at the close of the session are to be relied upon, form the subject of inquiry before a Committee of the House of Commons during the coming session.

It therefore appears to me to be a proper subject for discussion at this meeting, as the knowledge and practical experience of the members of our Society may enable them to make some valuable suggestions upon it.

Although much disappointment was felt by the Chambers of Commerce, who brought the subject before the Board of Trade two years ago, at the neglect of the Government in allowing its Trade Marks Bill to die out from want of care, I think they may find more than a compensation in the improvement of the measure which will result from the increased opportunities thus afforded for further consideration.

I would remind you that the Bill declared that the following offences should be misdemeanors, namely—the forging or imitating a trade mark, or the applying any such mark to any chattel or article with intent to defraud; the selling or exposing for sale any chattel or article bearing a forged or false trade mark with intent to defraud, the making or selling, or exposing for sale, any chattel or article, or the cover, bottle, reel, &c., containing it, with a false indication of its quantity, quality, measure, substance, or material; the forging, imitating, or falsely applying the names and marks of artists to any picture, engraving, sculpture, &c., or other work of art. And it was proposed to be enacted that no proceeding under that Act should affect any remedy which aggrieved persons may be entitled to at law or in equity.

These provisions are declaratory of the common law. It appears to me that the case of the *Queen v. Closs*, 27 L. J. M. C. 54, leaves no room for doubt that the offences described in the Bill are, without the aid of any statute, indictable. In that case Lord Chief Justice Cockburn is reported to have said—"We have carefully examined the authorities; and the result is that we think that if a person, in the course of his trade, openly and publicly carried on, put a false mark or token on an article so as to pass it off as a genuine one, when in fact it is only a spurious one, and the article is sold and the money is obtained by means of that false mark or token, that will be a cheat at common law: as for instance, if a man sold a gun with the mark of a particular manufacturer upon it, so as to make it appear to be the genuine production of the manufacturer, that would be a false mark or token, and the party would be guilty of a cheat, and therefore liable to punishment if the indictment were fairly framed to meet his case."

There are many reasons, nevertheless, why it is desirable to have a declaratory statute on the subject, and the Government and Parliament have recognised the necessity for such legislation; but unless it is clear and precise in its terms, and unless it provides the proper machinery for its easy administration, it would, in my opinion, be better to remain as we are a little longer. I am persuaded, however, that such a statute may, without much difficulty, be framed, provided those who prepare it will possess themselves of what has been done in this respect in other countries, and of what has been done here in matters analogous to trade marks, and will also make themselves thoroughly conversant with the difficulties with which the manufacturers have now to contend.

I do not propose in this paper to go into any critical examination of the Bill of last session, but to confine myself chiefly to the question, whether a Bill having for its object

the punishment of the piracy of trade marks as a misdemeanour can be complete without providing for a registration of marks.

We must first understand in what sense the term trade mark is to be used.

By a trade mark I do not understand a manufacturer's name, nor his label describing the quality of his wares, but a device used to indicate the person by whom, or the works where, the article bearing it was made or sold. What a crest or coat of arms is to a gentleman the trade mark is to the manufacturer.

The Bill of last session erred in not making this distinction. I do not mean in subjecting the fraudulent use of a name or label to the same punishment as the piracy of a mark that all such offences ought to be equally punished; but the error was in including them under the term trade mark.

The Bill declares that the expression trade mark shall extend to and include any name, letter, mark, device, figure, sign, seal, stamp, label, or other thing lawfully used by any person to denote any chattel to be of the manufacture, workmanship, production, or merchandise of such person.

This definition appears to me to make complicated and difficult what would otherwise be simple and easy; and it would also work great injustice and inconvenience.

Would it not be much simpler to apply the penalties of the Act to the fraudulent marking of goods offered for sale with the name or the trade mark of another, and declare that the so marking the wrapper, case, or other thing containing or holding goods, shall, for the purposes of the Act, be deemed to be a marking of the goods? I here suggest the description of the offence. I do not offer it as a complete definition; for, of course, provision must be made in it for fraudulent imitation of a name or mark, and for excluding the use of single letters as marks.

No description or definition of the name of another can be needed, nor need it be described what is meant by fraudulent marking. No manufacturer can need to have it explained that if he has the authority of another person to mark goods with his name, to do so is not fraudulent.

The only term requiring a definition is *trade mark* and this must be so defined as not to include the other terms *name* and *label*; and the definition I would suggest for such a Bill as I contemplate would be, that the term trade mark shall, for the purposes of the Act, be deemed to be a device used to indicate the person by whom, or the works at which, the article bearing such mark was made or sold.

It may be objected that this definition would exclude all terms merely descriptive of the article as "glacé thread," "Persian thread," "medicated balm," "solid-headed pins," &c. I reply, that I think it just and wise to exclude all such names. It appears to me unfair and contrary to public policy to allow to any one house the exclusive right to an adjective. In Prussia such a monopoly is forbidden. I would propose not to include them amongst those trade marks, the piracy of which is to be indictable as a misdemeanour. The present remedies by injunction, and action for damages will remain untouched, and parties who have established their right to the exclusive use of such words must remain content with those remedies.

Then arises the question, have we, in thus affording additional protection to the public and to the manufacturers, being the owners or users of trade marks, sufficiently provided against exposing other manufacturers to the danger of unwittingly incurring the penalties of the new statute?

We must not lay traps for the unwary. To render persons liable to punishment by imprisonment for offences hitherto classed amongst injuries, for which it was deemed, although erroneously, that the only remedies were by a suit in chancery or an action at law, is a change demanding the utmost caution. The statute by which it shall be effected ought to provide every means for giving publicity to the change, and for warning the trading community against the offence to be punished.

These observations do not apply to the piracy of another's name—because no one could do that innocently. The mere fact is evidence of fraud. Not so with a mark. A manufacturer desiring to use a trade mark may adopt a device which is already in use by another, without knowing that it is so. It may be said, that as he does this ignorantly, it would not be fraudulent, and consequently not punishable under the Act. True! But he may be indicted: the fact of his using another's mark would induce the grand jury to find a true bill. He might have the annoyance of having to prove

before a jury the absence of fraud—not always an easy thing for the most innocent to do.

The danger to innocent manufacturers may be avoided by providing in the statute for a *Registration of Marks*, and by excluding from the operation of the Bill the piracy of all marks not registered.

The registry would be open to inspection to all on payment of a moderate fee; and with this means of knowledge no excuse would remain for those who incurred the pains and penalties attached to the piracy of trade marks.

In addition to this advantage a registry would be valuable to the owners of marks in the increased certainty, and the decreased cost, in proving their title to their respective marks—and this would be no small advantage. The statute would of course declare that the registrar's certificate should be conclusive evidence of the title of the registered party, and this might be extended to the proceedings in the civil courts.

Without a registry a person has, in every case in which he complains of a piracy of his trade mark, to prove, often by several witnesses, that he has exclusively used the mark for a long period; and however frequently he may have to maintain his title to his trade mark, the same kind of evidence must be produced. With a registry, all that he would have to do in this respect would be to produce a certificate of the registrar. Of course he would have to prove his title previously to registering his mark, but this would be once for all.

In making provision for a registry we may be much assisted by a reference to the registry of designs—the work there done is analogous to what would have to be done in a registry of trade marks. I would propose to have the work done under the management of the same chief officer. It would not be difficult to increase the staff so as to do the additional work—the fees would well pay for such an arrangement.

The mode of proceeding in Prussia affords valuable hints to us. There the person desiring to register applies to a public officer, delivering to him three copies of the mark. This officer, known as the Trades or Manufactory Justice, gives public notice of the application, so that all persons objecting to the use of the mark by the claimant may be heard against the claim. It is the duty of the justice to hear and decide on those objections, and also to compare the mark claimed with those already on the register; and if he find that it is distinct from the marks already registered, and it does not infringe upon the rights of any of the opponents, and is in accordance with the requisitions of the ordinance, he allows the claim and enters it on the roll. This roll is open to search without charge. Each mark is connected with a particular trade, and cannot be transferred except to the proprietors of that trade; if the trade is discontinued then the right to the mark ceases.

In the establishment of a registry it would be necessary to require the applicant to send to the registrar two copies of the proposed mark in a given form; together with his name or the name of his firm, his place of business, and the descriptive name of the manufacture or goods on which he proposes to use his mark; and that the registrar should, on receiving such application, first ascertain whether the mark claimed is already on the registry for that manufacture, and if it be, to return the claim, and if it be free from such an objection, then the registrar should give notice in the *London Gazette*, and some paper published at or near the claimant's place of business, stating the particulars of the claim, and within what time notices of objection are to be sent in. On the expiration of that time, if there be no notice of objection, the claim would be enrolled, and a certificate attached to one of the copies of the mark sent to the claimant. If any notices of objection were received, then a copy of the claim, and one of the copies of the mark with the objection, might be sent to the county court within whose jurisdiction the claimant's business is carried on.

It should be the duty of the county court judge to hear and decide upon the claim and the objections, and remit the papers, with a certificate of his judgment, to the registrar; and the claim should either be allowed and enrolled, or refused, according to that judgment. I do not think it necessary to provide for any appeal; but this may easily be done if desired; and if a new court be created for patent causes, the appeals might be heard by that court.

A scale of fees and charges must be settled by the Board of Trade or the Treasury, and each claimant must send with his papers the proper amount. The payment of the costs

incurred in the county court must be decided by that court on hearing each case.

The Treasury settles the scale of fees under the Copyright of Designs Act (5 & 6 Vict. c. 100, s. 18), and in order to show that such modification of the fees first settled, necessarily rather speculative, as experience may show to be necessary will be made. I may mention that recently some of the fees for registering designs were reduced, on the representation of the Birmingham Chamber of Commerce that they were unnecessarily high. The superintendence of such departments would appear more properly to belong to the Board of Trade; but this is a matter of secondary importance.

Objections to claims must be founded upon the objector's superior title to the mark claimed; and he must be required to state in his notice, in addition to his name and place of business, how long he has used the mark claimed, and in connection with what goods he has so used it.

The proceedings in the county courts could be governed by a few simple regulations, requiring the bailiff to give notice to the claimant and objectors of the day of hearing, and subjecting the proceedings to such of the rules of practice in those courts as may be applicable.

The forms of claim, objections, advertisements, registry, certificates of registrar, and of county court, would of course be prescribed in the Act, and the working of the system would be an easy and inexpensive matter.

I mention the form of advertisements as a matter to be provided in the Act. Much expense would be saved by adopting a schedule form with headings, similar to those adopted in the parliamentary and burgess rolls. I am surprised that this has not occurred to those who are responsible for the conduct of the business of the bankruptcy and insolvency courts. How much more easy would it be to read down a schedule of names and dates than to weed them out of the unnecessary and oft repeated jargon of their advertisements, and the amount of money saved would be very great.

In the *Gazette* and other papers the registrar would have his schedule of claim somewhat in this form:—

Claimant.	Where business carried on.	Manufacture or goods to which mark to be applied.	Mark.	Day before which notice to be sent to registrar.
Elkington & Mason	Birmingham	Gold and silver and plated goods and medals	A Crown	
Smith & Wright	Birmingham	Metal and ornamental buttons	A Butterfly	
William Aston	Birmingham	Metal buttons	A Lion	
Millward & Son	Redditch	Needles	A Globe	
Dain, Watts, & Mantion	Birmingham	Buttons	A Swan	
British Iron Company	Corngreaves, Halesonon	Iron bars	A Lion	
Philip Williams & Sons	Wednesbury	Iron bars	A Mitre	

I have gone into this detail because I know that some have objected to the scheme of a registry from the apprehension of difficulties which would arise from the number of notices to be given and the entries to be made.

It is mere clerks work. If the notices be required to be sent by post, and the fees remitted by post office orders, how simple and easy would be the operations. The registrar would require only two books and two indexes, one for registering claims in the same form as the advertisement, with the addition of columns for writing the names of objectors, when and to what county court sent, what judgment given, and when certificates thereof received, and a reference to the number of the registry or roll on which claim entered, when allowed. The other book would be the registry for enrolling the claims allowed, answering to the first four columns of the advertisement. An index of manufactures and marks would be necessary, but I think not of names. A person searching the index would desire to know what marks would be used in connection with certain trades; his object being to learn what marks in his manufacture are registered, so that, in selecting a mark for himself, he may avoid any already registered. And in the searches to be made by the registrar, the mark or the manufacture would be the only thing to be ascertained.

Provision must be made as to the transfer of marks. They should pass with the trades with which they are connected.

and the right to each mark cease when its trade ceases to be carried on; and the proprietor must be required, on each devolution of ownership, to send particulars, to be under the penalty of losing the exclusive right to the mark.

In France the ownership of the mark continues for fifteen years, but may be renewed at the end of each period for another of the like duration.

The plan of registration may be objected to from its novelty, which in some minds always raises doubts and fears, and much good results from this wise dislike of change; but it must be borne in mind that it is proposed as a protection against the inconveniences of a change decided upon. And we have experience to guide us. Such a registration exists in France, Russia, Belgium, and Prussia; and in our country we have a somewhat analogous registration, under the copyright of Designs Act. This is carried on with satisfaction and success; and I cannot understand that greater difficulty would exist in the registry of trade marks—indeed, I do not believe there would be nearly so much to be done in this case as in the former. The objectors to a registration must, I think, have expected that it would necessarily include the names of manufactures. This would, indeed, render a registry too unwieldy to be attempted: such a plan would be as impracticable as it would be useless.

Some objection may be entertained by houses which are now in the undisputed enjoyment of trade marks from an apprehension that they might lose those marks by unscrupulous persons obtaining a title to them by getting a registry certificate of the same. Such attempts could scarcely be successful, and the improbability of success would operate to prevent them; but the owners of recognised marks may themselves prevent such dangers by immediately registering their marks; and if they take the trouble to understand the effect of its provisions they must be amongst the first to seek the protection of the statute; not so much to prevent a robbery of their mark, as to have a simpler and less costly means of supporting their title in legal proceedings and a more efficacious check against piracy.

The establishment of a registry of trade marks was urged upon the attention of the Board of Trade more than two years ago by the principal chambers of commerce; and subsequently the Birmingham chamber, on the request of that Board, submitted an outline of clauses for this purpose; and the then Board decided that the plan should not be adopted. What objections prevailed to its rejection we do not know.

Since that time the Sheffield Chamber of Commerce has prepared a Bill which included registration as a part of its scheme. Mr. Roebuck, the member for Sheffield, gave notice of amendments upon the Government Bill, embodying the provisions of the Sheffield Bill in reference to registration and convention with foreign countries.

I have not in this paper noticed the provisions of the Bill relating to sales by false indications of quantity or material, or the counterfeiting of an artist's name or mark on any work of art. These objects are properly within the purview of the Bill. The sale of goods by false tokens is the general title, including all the objects proposed to be provided by the Bill.

The systematic frauds of this class both in this and other countries are so extensive that it is necessary that some strong check should be provided; and I believe that when it is understood that the practice will be regarded no longer as a venial offence, but as a crime punishable with imprisonment, it will be deemed too dangerous or too disgraceful to be used.

THE OPENING OF THE MIDDLE TEMPLE LIBRARY.

The New Library of the Middle Temple was opened on Thursday last with great pomp and ceremony by his Royal Highness the Prince of Wales. During the early part of this week the usually silent courts of the Middle Temple were quite alive with the hum of preparation for the ceremonial which was to take place on the occasion. How briefs found their way through the confusion to their rightful owners it is difficult to say; and but that Term was so near at hand, one might have thought that all business was at a standstill. The benchers spared neither trouble nor expense to do proper honour to the occasion, and to accommodate all who had claims to be present. The demand for tickets was much greater than was anticipated, for members of the society came up from all parts of the country, and as the hall, spacious as are its proportions, would not contain a third of the expected company, the whole area of Fountain-court had been included in a handsome pavilion, which accommodated nearly 500 guests. In the small garden

round the fountain arcades of evergreens and other floral decorations were raised, and when illuminated in the evening by the lime light, had a very beautiful appearance. New arrangements had been made, too, for lighting the interior of the hall, which showed off its fine oak ceiling and panelling to the greatest advantage.

The first stone of the new building was laid by Sir Fortunatus Dwaris, in 1858. It is in the collegiate style of the 15th century, built from the design of Mr. Abraham, the architect. The lower portion is occupied by chambers. The cost of the building is stated to be under £14,000. The library, which is a room of handsome proportions, 96 feet long, 42 feet wide, and 70 feet high, occupies the upper portion, and is approached by a winding staircase in an octagonal tower at the side. The roof, which is not unlike that of Westminster Hall, except that it is two-centred, is of American pitch pine—the first time this wood has been used for the purpose in this country. The floor is of Portland stone, in panels, with Portland cement in the centre compartments. There is a stained glass window at each end; the oriel at the south is illuminated with the arms of the Royal Princes, from the time of Richard Cœur de Lion down to the present Prince of Wales; and the window at the north, which is one of the finest specimens of stained glass in the country, represents the shields of all who have been Benchers during the time of its erection. There are five windows at each side, which cast a dim studious light through silvered glass. Over the door is hung the portrait of the founder of the old library, Robert Ashley. Altogether, it is really a noble room, and even those who are most disposed to criticise the exterior, when they get inside cannot but admit that it is a credit to the Inn.

About half-past one o'clock the guard of honour of eighty rank and file of the Inns of Court Volunteer Corps appointed to receive the Prince, took up their position in the Vestibule. Punctually at two o'clock his Royal Highness arrived. The Treasurer, Mr. Anderson, Q.C., and the Attorney-General, Sir W. Atherton, Q.C., were awaiting him in the vestibule, and conducted him to the new Parliament Chamber, where the Benchers had already assembled, the guard of honour presenting arms and the band playing "God save the Queen." In attendance on his Royal Highness were Major-General Bruce and Major Teesdale, C.B. Here the Benchers were first presented in due form; and afterwards two representatives of the barristers, and two representatives of the students, together with the architect of the Library, had also the honour of being presented. A Parliament was then formed of the Masters of the Bench present. The proceedings here were very short. The Master Treasurer moved, and the Lord Chancellor seconded, first, "that his Royal Highness be admitted a member of the Middle Temple," and next, "that his Royal Highness be called to the degree of the outer bar, and that the oath, on publication of the call, be dispensed with." Both motions were carried unanimously, and the Prince was invested with the bar gown and subscribed the call-book. The next motion, also by the Treasurer, and seconded by the Lord Chancellor, was "that his Royal Highness be invited to the Bench." This motion was also agreed to, and the Prince assumed the Benchers' gown, and took his seat as a Master of the Bench, at the right hand of the Treasurer. The new Master next moved, "that the parliament do adjourn, and proceed to open the Library." This concluded the ceremony in the Parliament Chamber, and a procession was then formed to the library, the Prince of Wales and the Treasurer leading the way. Arrived in the library, the Prince took his station on the dais in the bay window, and the Treasurer read the following address:—

"May it please your Royal Highness,—We, the Treasurer and Masters of the Bench, barristers, and other members of the Society of the Middle Temple, gladly avail ourselves of this opportunity to express our warmest thanks for the honour which has been conferred on this Society by your Royal Highness having graciously consented to become one of our members, and to preside at the opening of the new Library.

"This ceremony cannot fail to interest all who duly appreciate the importance of the study of juridical science, and the diffusion of a knowledge of the laws which govern alike all ranks and orders of society, and who deem that the maintenance of its learning, no less than the preservation of its independence, is essential to the efficient administration of justice, and to the protection of the liberty of the subject.

"The Library in which we are assembled, built for the purpose of providing the members of this Inn with improved opportunities of study, may be regarded as an earnest that the Masters of the Bench take a deep interest in the exertions of

the student, and are anxious to encourage a spirit of generous rivalry for the honours which have been set apart as rewards of merit.

"It is not, we trust, presumptuous to hope that, among those who may pursue their studies in this room, many will be found not unworthy successors of those great lawyers and statesmen, to whose names, enrolled in the books of our Society, and many of which grace these walls, we refer with legitimate pride.

"We recognise in the honour which your Royal Highness has this day conferred upon us a manifestation of that respect for the law for which your Royal House has always been distinguished, and never more so than during the happy reign of her Most Gracious Majesty—a reign specially marked by the many important improvements in our laws—and we feel assured that the enrolment of your Royal Highness as one of our body will animate us all with fresh zeal ever to uphold the dignity of the profession, and to maintain the high character of our ancient society:—

To which his Royal Highness read the following reply in a clear, firm tone, which, notwithstanding the crowded state of the room, was audible nearly all over it:—

"Gentlemen,—I thank you cordially for this address, and for the gratifying terms in which you refer to my presence here to-day.

"I have gladly accepted your invitation, and esteem it a high privilege to be enrolled on your list of benchers, and permitted to inaugurate the opening of this beautiful library, so worthy of your ancient and renowned Society.

"Although but very imperfectly acquainted with the noble science to the study of which this edifice is more specially devoted, I am deeply sensible of its vast interest and importance, and I value, as they deserve, the learning and integrity for which the Bench and Bar of this country are so justly celebrated.

"Your Inn has contributed many to the long array of illustrious names which adorn our legal annals; and, while heartily congratulating you on the completion of this great work, I venture to express a fervent hope that the students within its walls may largely profit by the advantages so wisely and liberally provided for them, and may successfully emulate the fame of their eminent predecessors."

The Prince then signified his pleasure to the Treasurer that the library be opened, and the Treasurer then said, "By command of His Royal Highness this library is declared to be opened." This concluded the two ceremonials, which together did not last more than half-an-hour, and the procession then left the library in the same order, and went to the Temple Church, where there was a special service which had been drawn up by the Master, Dr. Robinson.

At 4 o'clock some 750 guests sat down to what was modestly called a *déjeuner*, but which was in fact a sumptuous banquet. In the hall there was not room for more than 350, including the guests on the dais; the rest were accommodated in the pavillion hard by. The Treasurer was in the chair, having the Prince on his right, and the Duke of Cambridge on his left hand. In addition to the other guests whose names are given, Lord Brougham joined the company at dinner. The gallery over the screen was filled with ladies. As previously arranged, there were no speeches. The Treasurer gave in rapid succession, "The Queen," "The Prince Consort," "The Prince of Wales," "The Duke of Cambridge, and the rest of the Royal Family," all of which were duly honoured.

The Prince of Wales then rose and said,—Gentlemen, I wish all prosperity to the profession, and I beg leave to give you "Domus."

The speech and toast were received with great enthusiasm. Shortly afterwards the Prince left the hall, accompanied by the other visitors, loudly cheered, as upon entering. Next to his Royal Highness, Colonel Brewster, the Commander of the Inns of Court Volunteers, sat, and to judge from the warmth of his reception, appeared to be the most popular man present, an advantage which he probably owes to the excellent state of efficiency to which he has brought that fine corps.

The day was brought to a close by an evening *conversazione*, for which the Prince did not remain. He left immediately after the *déjeuner*, after expressing to the Master his high gratification at the events of the day.

The general arrangements for the accommodation and marshalling of the guests were excellent, and did great credit to all concerned in carrying them out, and though there must have been at one time nearly a thousand people collected together, the complete success of the day was not marred by the slightest confusion, nor, as far as could be known, by a single disappointment.

Law Students' Journal.

MICHAELMAS TERM EXAMINATION.

Persons applying to be admitted attorneys, are required to attend on Wednesday, the 13th, and Thursday, the 14th Nov. next, at half-past nine in the forenoon, at the Hall of the Incorporated Law Society, Chancery-lane, in order to be examined. The examination will commence at ten o'clock precisely, and close at four o'clock each day.

Articles of clerkship and assignment, with answers to the questions as to due service, according to the regulations approved by the judges, must be left with the secretary on or before Friday the 8th Nov.

Where articles have not expired, but will expire during term, or in the vacation following such term, the candidate may be examined conditionally; but the articles must be left within the first seven days of term, and answers up to that time. If part of the term has been served with a barrister, special pleader, or London agent, answers to the questions must be obtained from them, as to the time served with each respectively.

On the first day of examination, papers will be delivered to each candidate, containing questions to be answered in writing, classed under the several heads of—1. Preliminary. 2. Common and statute law, and practice of the courts. 3. Conveyancing.

On the second day, further papers will be delivered to each candidate, containing questions to be answered in—4. Equity, and practice of the courts. 5. Bankruptcy, and practice of the courts. 6. Criminal law, and proceedings before justices of the peace.

Each candidate is required to answer all the preliminary questions (No. 1); and also to answer in three of the other heads of inquiry, viz.:—common law, conveyancing, and equity. The examiners will continue the practice of proposing questions in bankruptcy and in criminal law and proceedings before justices of the peace, in order that candidates who have given their attention to these subjects may have the advantage of answering such questions, and having the correctness of their answers in those departments taken into consideration in summing up the merit of their general examination.

LAW LECTURES AT THE INCORPORATED LAW SOCIETY, 1861-62.

MR. FREEMAN OLIVER HAYNES, on Conveyancing, Monday, November 4.

MR. WILLIAM MURRAY, on Common Law and Mercantile Law, Friday, November 8.

The annual exhibition of chrysanthemums in the Inner Temple gardens commenced this week. The show this year is most magnificent. Three sides of the garden are occupied by the flowers, the best specimens being ranged on the north side of the garden, and placed under canvass. Mr. Broome, the society's gardener, has this year succeeded in infusing a slight lavender scent into these flowers. Those of our readers who delight in floriculture should take an early opportunity of viewing the splendid collection of flowers now offered for their inspection by the Benchers of the Inner Temple.

Births, Marriages, and Deaths.

BIRTHS.

BALL—On Oct. 30, at Pershore, the wife of Edwin Ball, Esq. of a daughter.

DEMPSTER—On Oct. 28, at Mordon House, Greenwich, the wife of R. Frederic Dempster, Esq., Solicitor, of a son.

MERRIFIELD—On Oct. 22, at Brighton, the wife of a Frederic Merrifield, Esq., Barrister-at-law, of a daughter.

STAPYLTON—On Oct. 27, at 30, Gloucester-square, Hyde-park, the wife of Martin B. Stapylton, Esq., Barrister-at-law, of a daughter, who survived her birth only a few hours.

MARRIAGES.

BALSTON—OLIVER—On Oct. 24, Thomas Balston, Esq., of the Inner Temple, Barrister-at-law, to Ellen Frances, daughter of the Rev. W. M. Oliver, rector of Bovingey, Essex.

ENGLEHEART—WILCOX—On Oct. 22, Edward Curteis, son of Nathaniel Brown Engleheart, Esq., of Doctor's-common, to Emilie, daughter of Robert Wilcoxon, Esq., of Monmouth-yard.

Probat
7th, Frid
Full Co
ber 13.
Divorc
Saturday
Probat
Friday 29
Divorc
with Jur
ception of
The Ju
tions at 1
day durin
Papers
o'clock on

It is on
A fee of
ruptcy w
county c
exceed £
The abo
the word
Act.

14th Oc

STATE F
Oct. 24,
17, Clem

HARVEY—RUSSELL—On Oct. 29, John Harvey, Esq., of Caw House, county Londonderry, Ireland, to Emily, daughter of the late Sir William Oldnall Russell, Chief Justice of Bengal.

HASKINS—HULME—On Oct. 24, John Haskins, Esq., of Hadlow House, Mayfield, Sussex, and Elm-grove, Ventnor, Isle of Wight, to Josephine, daughter of the late John Walter Hulme, Esq., Chief Justice of Hongkong.

SMITH—TRINDER—On Oct. 29, Richard Fryer Smith, Esq., of Cheadle, Staffordshire, to Louisa Sarah, daughter of the late W. H. Trinder, Esq., of John-street, Bedford-row.

TRISTRAM—BURGH—On Oct. 26, at Dublin, Thomas Hutchinson Tristram, Esq., D.C.L., Advocate, Doctor's-commons, to Flora, daughter of the late very Rev. Thomas John de Burgh, Dean of Cloyne.

WATTS—WEBB—On Oct. 23, John Onslow Watts, Esq., of Lincoln's-inn, Barrister-at-law, to Caroline Mary, daughter of Major Vere Webb, of Bath.

DEATHS.

BURTON—On Oct. 21, William Warwick Burton, Esq., of 14, Lincoln's-inn-fields.

CHAPMAN—On Oct. 21, at Weston-super-Mare, Lucy, daughter of Ralph Chapman, Esq., Solicitor, aged 13 years.

CHEFFINS—On Oct. 23, Charles Frederick Cheffins, Esq., of 11, Southampton-buildings, Chancery-lane, aged 54.

FRY—On Oct. 14, George Fry, Esq., of 18, Great Portland-street, London, aged 51, son of the late — Fry, Esq., of the Registry-office, Chancery-lane.

GLENNIE—On Oct. 20, John Irving Glennie, Esq., of Doctor's-commons, aged 65.

NETT—On Oct. 28, at Canterbury, John Nutt, Esq., aged 69, for many years Town Clerk and Clerk of the Peace for the city and borough.

PARKER—On Oct. 30, aged 58, Caroline, the wife of Thomas Parker, Esq., of 40, Bedford-row.

PRIDHAM—On Oct. 24, at Plymouth, Henry, son of George Pridham, Esq., aged 27.

SKENE—On Sept. 23, on board the P. & O. steamship Simla on his homeward voyage from Ceylon, James Francis Skene, Esq., advocate, son of George Skene, Esq., Professor of Law in the University of Glasgow, in his 29th year.

Court Papers.

Court of Probate

AND

Court for Divorce and Matrimonial Causes.

SITTINGS IN AND AFTER MICHAELMAS TERM, 1861.

Probate Causes without Juries—Wednesday, November 6th, Thursday, 7th, Friday, 8th, Saturday, 9th.

Full Court for Divorce and Matrimonial Causes—Wednesday, November 13.

Divorce Causes without Juries—Thursday, November 14, Friday 15, Saturday 16, Wednesday 20, Thursday 21, Friday 22, Saturday 23.

Probate Causes with Juries—Wednesday, November 27, Thursday 28, Friday 29, Saturday 30.

Divorce Causes with Juries will be taken after the Probate Causes with Juries have been heard, and until the 24th December, with the exception of Mondays and Tuesdays.

The Judge will sit in chambers at 11 o'clock, and in court to hear motions at 12 o'clock, on Tuesday, November 5th, and each succeeding Tuesday during the sittings of the Court.

Papers for motions are to be left with the clerk of the papers before two o'clock on Thursdays.

General Orders in Bankruptcy.

It is ordered as follows, that is to say,—

A fee of £1 shall be paid on every petition for adjudication of bankruptcy when presented to the London Court of Bankruptcy or to a county court by debtors who are not traders, and whose debts do not exceed £300, and who do not petition in forma pauperis.

The above fee to be received and taken by means of a stamp having the word "Bankruptcy" impressed or affixed thereon as provided by the Act.

WESTBURY, C.

JOHN S. M. FENBLANQUE, Commissioner,
EDWARD HOLROYD, Commissioner.

14th October, 1861.

London Gazettes.

Windings-up of Joint Stock Companies.

FRIDAY, Nov. 1, 1861.

UNLIMITED IN CHANCERY.

STATE FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY.—Petition for winding up, presented Oct. 24, will be heard before V.C. Wood, on Nov. 9. Gibbs & Tucker, 17, Clement's-lane, London, Solicitors for petitioner.

Professional Partnerships Dissolved.

TUESDAY, Oct. 29, 1861.

GREEN, FRANK HENRY, & AUGUSTUS JONES, Attorneys and Solicitors, 1 Lincoln's-inn-fields, Middlesex. Oct. 11, by mutual consent.

Creditors under 22 & 23 Vict. cap. 35.

Last Day of Claim.

TUESDAY, Oct. 29, 1861.

ALLDIS, JOHN, 2 and 3, Eastcheap, London, and of Jamaica Level, Rotherhithe, Surrey, Eating-house Keeper. Dec. 31. Sol. C. E. Freeman, 11, Bucklersbury, London, E.C.

BRADNEY, Rev. JOHN HOPKINS, Leigh House, Bradford, Wilts, Clerk. Nov. 30. Sols. Bockett's Son, & Barton, 60, Lincoln's-inn-fields, London.

BRAY, HENRY, East Ilsley, Berks, Jockey. Nov. 30. Sol. W. Hulbert, East Ilsley, Berks.

CLARE, JOHN, Sankey Bridges, Lancashire, Merchant. Dec. 1. Sols. Marsh & Barratt, Warrington.

DICKINSON, WILLIAM, 2, Wellington-place, Limehouse, Middlesex, Master Mariner. Jan. 1. Sol. W. Stocken, 61, Cornhill, London.

GODFREY, WILLIAM PARKER, Old Brentford, Middlesex, Grocer and Cheesemonger. Within one month from Oct. 22. Sol. A. Rhodes, 2, Church-court, Clement's-lane, London.

GRIFFITH, RICHARD, 22, Bedford-street North, Liverpool, and senior partner in the firm of Messrs. Griffith, Sons, & Palethorpe, Brokers, Liverpool. Dec. 25. Sol. J. L. Bromfield, 23, Newgate-street, Chester.

HALE, SAMUEL WILLIAM, Bilston, Staffordshire, Wine and Spirit Merchant. Dec. 2. Sol. C. G. Brown, Bilston.

HURRY, ROGER, Turves, Whittlesey, Isle of Ely, Farmer. Dec. 1. Sol. G. M. Smith, Whittlesey.

KENT, WILLIAM, 7, Walcot-terrace, Bath, Gent. Dec. 31. Sols. Stone Chamberlayne, & King, 13, Queen-square, Bath.

LEE, JOHN BARTON, Lower Stonnall, Staffordshire, Gent. Dec. 16. Sol. C. Bridges, 17, Temple-street, Birmingham.

MAITLAND, LUCIA, Greenheys, Manchester, Widow. Dec. 2. Sols. Ker-shaw & Bullock, 29, Kennedy-street, Manchester.

MANLEY, JAMES, 1, Walcot Parade, Bath. Dec. 21. Sols. Stone, Chamberlayne, & King, 13, Queen-square, Bath.

MARTIN, REVEREND JOHN, Bunbury, Cheshire, Clerk. Dec. 24. Sol. J. Broadhurst, Hospital-street, Nantwich.

NOHMAN, GEORGE, Bath, Esq. Dec. 31. Sols. Stone, Chamberlayne, & King, 13, Queen-square, Bath.

OLIVER, JOHN, Mickley, Kirkby Malzeard, Yorks. Nov. 16. Sol. J. Calvert, Masham, Yorkshire.

PARRY, WILLIAM, formerly of Kempsey, and late of London-road, Worcester, Gent. Nov. 30. Sol. J. Stallard, 6, Foregate-street, Worcester.

SEATH, JOHN, North Yarmouth, Norfolk, Mariner in the Merchant Service. Nov. 30. Sols. Emmet & Son, 14, Bloomsbury-square, Middlesex.

WEBB, HENRY, Ronkswood, Saint Martin, Worcester, Merchant and Chemical Manure Manufacturer. Nov. 30. Sol. J. Stallard, 6, Foregate-street, Worcester.

WHITE, WILLIAM, Sen., Spaxton, Somersetshire, Yeoman. Dec. 2. Sol. W. Brice, Bridgewater, Somersetshire.

WILLIAMS, WILLIAM, Flookersbrook, Cheshire, Tanner. Dec. 10. Sol. G. Tibbits, St. John-street, Chester.

Deeds registered pursuant to Bankruptcy Act, 1861.

TUESDAY, Oct. 22, 1861.

DOBBS, JOHN, Liverpool, Corn Broker. Oct. 18. Composition. Reg. Oct. 25.

FAWCETT, JOHN, 17, Sydney-place, Commercial-road, East, Middlesex Carpet and Furniture Dealer. Oct. 18. Composition. Reg. Oct. 28.

MELLING, JAMES, Crescent, Birmingham, Bath Proprietor. Oct. 18. Composition. Reg. Oct. 26.

OVEN, THOMAS, Welchpool, Montgomery, Grocer. Oct. 12. Assignment. Reg. Oct. 28.

SIMPSON, FRANCIS, High-street, Newington, Surrey, China and Glass Dealer. Oct. 17. Arrangement and inspectorship. Reg. Oct. 25.

TAYLOR, ROBERT, and JABEZ TAYLOR, Manchester, Wholesale Stationers. Oct. 21. Composition. Reg. Oct. 26.

Assignments for Benefit of Creditors.

TUESDAY, Oct. 29, 1861.

CASPLE, WILLIAM, Somers-road, Southsea, Southampton, Baker and Grocer. Oct. 10. Sols. H. & R. W. Ford, 170, Queen-street, Portsea.

DERHAM, RICHARD JONES, 46, Redcliff-street, Bristol, Cooper. Oct. 2. Sols. King & Plummer, 5, Exchange-buildings East, Bristol.

JEFFRIES, WILLIAM, Jacob-street, Bristol, Smith. Oct. 10. Sols. King & Plummer, 5, Exchange-buildings East, Bristol.

RICE, JOSEPH, Peel Causeway, Bowdon, near Manchester, Contractor and Brickmaker. Oct. 3. Sol. D. Boote, 52, Brown street, Manchester.

RYDILL, GEORGE, Dewsbury, Yorkshire, Auctioneer and Commission Agent. Oct. 4. Sols. Scofield & Oldroyd, Dewsbury.

Bankrupts.

TUESDAY, Oct. 29, 1861.

ABRAHAM, JOHN, Dunstable, Bedfordshire, Straw Hat Manufacturer. Pet. Oct. 22. Registrar, Hazlitt: first meeting, Nov. 8 at 2; Basinghall-street. Off. Ass. Stanfield. Sols. Crossley & Burn, 34, Lombard-street, London.

ASTLES, FREDERICK WILLIAM, Smethwick, Staffordshire, Schoolmaster and Agent. Pet. Oct. 14. Dec. 5 at 11; Birmingham. Off. Ass. Whitmore. Sols. James & Knight, Birmingham.

AUSTIN, JOSEPH, Kippay, Yorkshire, Maltster. Pet. Oct. 26. First meeting, Nov. 11 at 11; Leeds. Off. Ass. Hope. Sol. Coleman, Pontefract; or J. Blackburn, Leeds.

BACON, ROBERT, late of Blackmore, Essex, Publican, Plumber, and Glazier. Pet. Oct. 25. Registrar, Higgins: first meeting, Nov. 8 at 2; Basinghall-street. Off. Ass. Caman. Sol. Hand, 22, Coleman-street.

BEALE, JOHN SAMUEL, 27, Puddington-green, Middlesex, Surgeon and Apothecary. Pet. Oct. 28. Registrar, Miller: first meeting, Nov. 11 at 2; Basinghall-street. Off. Ass. Edwards. Sol. Clarke, 2, Stanley-place, Puddington-green, London.

BELL, THOMAS, York, Chemist and Druggist. Pet. Oct. 28. First meeting, Nov. 8 at 11; Leeds. Off. Ass. Young. Sols. Richardson & Cobb York; or Bond & Barwick, Leeds.

BILINGTON, FREDERICK, Commercial Dining Rooms, 73, Cheapside London. Pet. Oct. 22 (in forma pauperis). Registrar, Miller: first meeting, Nov. 11 at 10; Basinghall-street. Off. Ass. Edwards.

BURGESS, WILLIAM, 24, Sussex-street, Piccadilly, Middlesex, House Agent and Furniture Dealer. Pet. Oct. 24. In forma pauperis. Registrar, Hazlitt: first meeting, Nov. 9 at 11; Basinghall-street. Off. Ass. Stansfeld.

COLWELL, EDWIN ALFRED, formerly of 110, Stamford-street, Blackfriars, Surrey, then of 6, Peter-street, Islington, and now of 14, High Holborn, Middlesex, Wholesale Milliner. Pet. Oct. 24. Registrar, Abraham: first meeting, Nov. 7 at 10; Basinghall-street. Off. Ass. Bell. Sol. Phibbs, 20, Coleman-street.

COPPLESTONE, MATTHEWS, late of King's-road, Brighton, then of 1, Chesham-walk, Chelsea, Middlesex, but now of 8, The Terrace, Barnes, Surrey, Wine Merchant. Pet. Oct. 28. Registrar, Miller: first meeting, Nov. 11 at 11; Basinghall-street. Off. Ass. Edwards. Sol. Kisch, 8, Lancaster-place, Strand, London.

DEAKINS, FRANCIS HENRY, Feathers Hotel, Ledbury, Herefordshire, Licensed Victualler. Pet. Oct. 14. Dec. 5 at 11; Birmingham. Off. Ass. Kinnear. Sols. East & Parry, 45, Ann-street, Birmingham.

DELANEY, NICHOLAS HERBERT, Liverpool, Commission Agent and Ship Owner. Pet. Oct. 26. Registrar, Lee: first meeting, Nov. 9 at 11; Liverpool. Off. Ass. Turner. Sol. Pemberton, 13, Cable-street, Liverpool.

DENNY, ARTHUR SILBERT, 36, Dean-street, Oxford-street, Soho, Middlesex, Engineer. Pet. Oct. 22. Registrar, Abraham: first meeting, Nov. 8 at 1; Basinghall-street. Off. Ass. Johnson.

DICKINSON, ISAAC, Bennington, near Stevenage, Hertford, Baker. Pet. Oct. 23. Registrar, Winslow: first meeting, Nov. 12, at 1; Basinghall-street. Off. Ass. Pennell. Sols. Harrison and Lewis, Old Jewry, London.

DICKINSON, WATSON JAMES, 1 Friar-street, Blackfriars-road, Surrey, Coffee-house Keeper, and Clerk to a Builder. Pet. Oct. 22. Registrar, Abraham: first meeting, Nov. 12, at 11; Basinghall-street. Off. Ass. Johnson.

DIXON, GEORGE, HENZELL Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Coal, Coke, Chemical and Iron Merchant, and Commission Agent (Dixon & Co.). Pet. Oct. 26. Registrar, Gibson: first meeting, Nov. 9, at 1; Newcastle-upon-Tyne. Off. Ass. Baker. Sols. Cram & Legg, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

FORSTER, JOSEPH, 9, King's-college-road, Saint John's-wood, Hampstead, Middlesex, Commercial Traveller. Pet. Oct. 26. Registrar, Abraham: first meeting, Nov. 9 at 12; Basinghall-street. Off. Ass. Johnson. Sol. Medcalf, 9, Tokenhouse-yard, Lothbury.

FROND, STEPHEN, otherwise called John Edward Frond, Landsdowne-road, Notting-hill, Middlesex, Builder. Pet. Oct. 23. Registrar, Miller: first meeting, Nov. 9 at 12; Basinghall-street. Off. Ass. Edwards. Sol. H. H. Poole, 58, Bartholomew-close, London.

FYFE, JANE & WILLIAM THOMAS FYFE, Deptford, Kent, Lightermen. Pet. Oct. 26. Registrar, Hazlitt: first meeting, Nov. 9 at 2; Basinghall-street. Off. Ass. Graham. Sol. W. Sandon, Deptford, Kent.

HARDMAN, MARIA, Palicrort, Lancashire, Tailor and Woollen Draper. Pet. Oct. 26. Registrar, Wilde: first meeting, Nov. 9 at 11; Manchester. Off. Ass. Fraser. Sol. D. Boote, Brown-street, Manchester.

HARRISON, GEORGE HENRY DE STRABOLOS NEVILLE PLANTAGENET, 22, Kensington-gardens-square, Middlesex. Pet. Oct. 26. Informa pauperis. Registrar, Winslow: first meeting, Nov. 11 at 2; Basinghall-street. Off. Ass. Pennell.

HAWTHORN, JOHN, Burslem, Staffordshire, Builder. Pet. Oct. 19. First meeting, Nov. 9 at 2; Burslem. Off. Ass. Whitmore. Sols. E. C. Lees, Burslem, or J. Smith, Birmingham.

HEADLAND, THOMAS, 91, Bernondsey New-road, Surrey, Leather Seller. Pet. Oct. 28. Registrar, Miller: first meeting, Nov. 11 at 12; Basinghall-street. Off. Ass. Edwards. Sol. R. G. Chipperfield, 3, Trinity-street, Southwark, Surrey.

HOBSON, RICHARD, Marlboro-road, St. John's-wood, Middlesex, formerly Secretary to an Insurance Office. Pet. Oct. 28. Registrar, Abraham: first meeting, Nov. 11 at 1; Basinghall-street. Off. Ass. Johnson.

HOLLINGSHEAD, EDWARD, 4, Leckwith-road, Canton, Llandoff, Glamorgan, Fancy Potter. Pet. Oct. 23. Registrar, Langley: first meeting, Nov. 22 at 10; Cardiff. Off. Ass. Langley. Sol. F. J. Wilcocks, Arcade-chambers, Cardiff.

HOWITT, WILLIAM, 1, Ravenscourt-cottages, West End, Hammersmith, Middlesex, Carpenter and Builder. Pet. Oct. 26. Registrar, Miller: first meeting, Nov. 9 at 12; Basinghall-street. Off. Ass. Edwards. Sol. W. H. Dashwood, 43, James-grove, Peckham; and 3, Falcon-court, Fleet-street, London.

HULSTON, SARAH, 237, Gooch-street, Birmingham, Pocket Book Manufacturer. Pet. Oct. 23. First meeting, Nov. 11 at 11; Birmingham. Off. Ass. Whitmore. Sol. R. H. Foster, Birmingham.

HUNTER, JOHN, 9, Wolsey-terrace, Kentish-town, Middlesex, Gent. Pet. Oct. 29 (in forma pauperis). Registrar, Winslow: first meeting, Nov. 23 at 11.30; Basinghall-street. Off. Ass. Pennell.

HUNTER, THOMAS, 7, Baring-street, New North-road, Hoxton, Linen and Woollen Draper. Pet. Oct. 25. Registrar, Hazlitt: first meeting, Nov. 8, at 3; Basinghall-street. Off. Ass. Graham. Sols. Treherne and Wolferton, Gresham-street, London.

IRBY, THOMAS, late of Bowell, Northampton, Carpenter and Builder, then of Edmonton, Middlesex, and afterwards and now of 78, Regent-street, Litchurch, Derby, Journeyman Carpenter. Pet. Oct. 24. Registrar, Winslow: first meeting, Nov. 11, at 12; Basinghall-street. Off. Ass. Pennell. Sol. J. J. Rae, 18, Warwick-Court, Gray's-inn, London.

JOLLEY, JOHN, Whitechapel, Liverpool, Clothier. Pet. Oct. 21. Registrar, Brougham: first meeting, Nov. 11, at 12; Liverpool. Off. Ass. Bird. Sols. Haigh and Deane, Liverpool; and Sale, Worthington, Shipman and Seidon, Manchester.

JONES, EDWARD, 12, Birkett-street, Richmond-row, Liverpool, Slater and Plasterer. Pet. Oct. 25. Registrar, Hime: first meeting, Nov. 8 at 12; Liverpool. Off. Ass. Hime.

KINZETT, HENRY, 142, St. John-street-road, Clerkenwell, Middlesex, Artificial Florist. Pet. Oct. 26. Registrar, Winslow: first meeting, Nov. 9 at 11; Basinghall-street. Off. Ass. Pennell. Sol. Lewis & Son, 7, Wilmington-square, London.

LEMAN, ALFRED, formerly of Highfield-street, Liverpool, Ale and Stout Store Keeper, Poplar, Middlesex, Commercial Traveller. Pet. Oct. 25. (In forma pauperis). Registrar, Miller: first meeting, Nov. 9 at 11; Basinghall-street. Off. Ass. Edwards.

MEACKE, JOHN BUSH, Morford-street, Bath, Carpenter and Builder. Pet. Oct. 25. Registrar, Orme: first meeting, Nov. 8 at 11; Bristol. Off.

AS. ACARMAN, Sols. Slack & Simmons, Bath, or to Abbot, Lucas, & Leonard, Bristol.

MUNDAY, JAMES, 7, York-street, King-cross-street, Halifax, Excavator and Contractor. Pet. Oct. 25. Registrar, Rankin: first meeting, Nov. 8 at 10; Halifax. Off. Ass. Rankin. Sols. Norris & Foster, Halifax.

NEWTON, AUGUSTUS, 58, Curzon-street, Mayfair, Middlesex, Esq. Pet. Oct. 24. Registrar, Hazlitt: first meeting, Nov. 8 at 12; Basinghall-street. Off. Ass. Stansfeld. Sols. Harrison & Lewis, 6, Old Jewry, London.

OUTWAITE, ELIJAH, Leeds, Journeyman Plumber and Glazier. Pet. Oct. 28. First meeting, Nov. 11 at 11; Leeds. Off. Ass. Young. Sol. H. B. Harle, Leeds.

OUTWAITE, JOHN, Goole, Yorkshire, Journeyman Joiner and Model Maker. Pet. Oct. 28. First meeting, Nov. 11 at 11; Leeds. Off. Ass. Young. Sol. H. B. Harle, Leeds.

OUTWAITE, SAMUEL, Middlesborough, Yorkshire, Butcher. Pet. Oct. 28. First meeting, Nov. 11 at 11; Leeds. Off. Ass. Young. Sols. W. Myers, Darlington; or Bond & Barwick, Leeds.

OWEN, DAVID WILLIAM, 77, Highfield-street, Liverpool, Beer Retailer and Clerk to a Broker. Pet. Oct. 25. Registrar, Hime: first meeting, Nov. 8 at 12; Liverpool. Off. Ass. Hime.

PENTECOST, ISAAC, 7, Lewisham-street, Great Queen-street, Westminster, Middlesex, Beershop Keeper and General Dealer. Pet. Oct. 22 (in forma pauperis). Registrar, Higgins: first meeting, Nov. 8 at 11; Basinghall-street. Off. Ass. Cannan.

PERKINS, JOB, 8, Angel-court, Skinner-street, London, Journeyman Printer. Pet. Oct. 25. Registrar, Higgins: first meeting, Nov. 8 at 12; Basinghall-street. Off. Ass. Cannan. Sol. H. J. Preston, 10, Austin-friars.

PHIMLEY, WILLIAM, Cape Nursery, Shepherd's Bush, Middlesex, Market Gardener. Pet. Oct. 26. Registrar, Higgins: first meeting, Nov. 9 at 1; Basinghall-street. Off. Ass. Cannan. Sol. R. Jones, 3, New Inn, Strand.

PRENTIS, JOHN WOOD, 207, Sherlock-street, Birmingham, Grocer and Provision Merchant. Pet. Oct. 25. Registrar, Wilson: first meeting, Nov. 8 at 11.30; Birmingham. Off. Ass. Whitmore. Sols. Beale & Marigold, Watropo-street, Birmingham.

PRESGOTT, THOMAS WILLIAM TOTTINGHAM, 37, Bryanslane-street, Portman-square, Middlesex. Pet. Oct. 19. Registrar, Orme: first meeting, Nov. 11 at 12; Bristol. Off. Ass. Millar. Sols. F. L. Syms, 7, Farnval's-inn, London; or A. Henderson, Bristol.

QUINN, THOMAS, 85, Scotland-road, Liverpool, Draper. Pet. Oct. 19. Registrar, Lee: first meeting, Nov. 11 at 11; Liverpool. Off. Ass. Turner. Sols. Sole, Turner, & Turner, 68, Aldermanbury, London, or to Dodge & Wynne, 7, Union-court, Castle-street, Liverpool.

RAVEN, SAMUEL, 32, Douglas-road, Islington, Middlesex, Solicitor. Pet. Oct. 25. Registrar, Miller: first meeting, Nov. 8 at 12; Basinghall-street. Off. Ass. Edwards. Sol. T. N. Jenkins, 31, Nicholas-lane, London.

RIDER, THOMAS GEORGE, 1, Albion-place, Camberwell New-road, Surrey, Leather Merchant. Pet. Oct. 28. Registrar, Hazlitt: first meeting, Nov. 12 at 2; Basinghall-street. Off. Ass. Stansfeld. Sol. L. Hand, 23, Coleman-street, London.

ROUTLEDGE, CHRISTOPHER, Lower Sydenham, Kent, Brick Maker. Pet. Oct. 23. Registrar, Winslow: first meeting, Nov. 23 at 11; Basinghall-street. Off. Ass. Pennell. Sol. H. B. Silvester, 18, Great Dover-street, Newington, Surrey.

SIMMONS, HENRY PARISH, 6, Charles-place, Hertford-road, Kingsland, Middlesex, Gold Beater. Pet. Oct. 26. Registrar, Abraham: first meeting, Nov. 9 at 11; Basinghall-street. Off. Ass. Bell. Sol. Beard, 10, Basinghall-street.

SMITH, EDWARD BARNES, Woodcote, Epsom, Surrey, Horse Dealer. Pet. Oct. 23. Registrar, Winslow: first meeting, Nov. 9 at 2; Basinghall-street. Off. Ass. Pennell. Sols. Gibbs & Tucker, 17, Clements-lane, London.

SMITH, GEORGE HEDGCOMBE, North Perrot near Crewkerne, Somersetshire, Twine and Wire Manufacturer. Pet. Oct. 25. Registrar, Carey: first meeting, Nov. 11 at 1; Exeter. Off. Ass. Hirtzel. Sols. Dommet and Canning, Chard; or J. E. H. W. Clarke, Exeter.

SMITH, WILLIAM TAYLOR, and WADE HAMPTON SMITH, Sedgley, Staffordshire, Mine Drainers. Pet. Oct. 14. Nov. 29 at 11; Birmingham. Off. Ass. Kinnear. Sols. Hayes & Wright, Oldbury; or Hodgson & Allen, Birmingham.

SPRINGMANN, CHARLES, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Ship Broker and Merchant. Pet. Oct. 25. Registrar, Gibson: first meeting, Nov. 8 at 11; Newcastle-upon-Tyne. Off. Ass. Baker. Sols. Daglish & Stewart, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

STANDER, SAMUEL, 137, Church-street, Bethnal-green, Middlesex, Grocer and Tea Dealer. Pet. Oct. 28. Registrar, Higgins: first meeting, Nov. 11 at 1; Basinghall-street. Off. Ass. Cannan. Sol. J. A. Jukes, 10, Bridgewater-square, Barbican.

SWALLOW, RICHARD, 7, Strait, Saint Martin, Lincoln, Beerhouse Keeper, Furniture Dealer, and Paper Hanger. Pet. Oct. 22. Registrar, Uppley: Nov. 8 at 12; Lincoln. Off. Ass. Uppley. Sols. Brown & Sons, Lincoln.

TAYLOR, THOMAS, Blackwell Mills, Darlington, Durham, Miller, Contractor, and Provision Dealer. Pet. Oct. 26. Registrar, Gibson: first meeting, Nov. 9 at 12; Newcastle-upon-Tyne. Off. Ass. Baker. Sol. H. Storey, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

TINGLE, JOSEPH CHILD, Thame, Oxfordshire, Brewer. Pet. Oct. 28. Com. Goulburn: Nov. 9 at 11, and Dec. 9 at 12; Basinghall-street. Off. Ass. Pennell. Sols. Harrison & Lewis, 6, Old Jewry, London.

TODD, JOSEPH, Exmouth, Devonshire, Gent. Pet. Oct. 25. Registrar, Carey: first meeting, Nov. 8 at 12; Exeter. Off. Ass. Hirtzel. Sol. H. C. Adams, Exmouth, or Turner & Turner, Notting-hill, Middlesex, Commission Agent. Pet. Oct. 23. Registrar, Winslow: first meeting, Nov. 9 at 1; Basinghall-street. Off. Ass. Pennell. Sol. J. R. Chidley, 56, Old Jewry, London.

WALKER, WILLIAM, Walsall, Staffordshire, Harness Maker and Covered Furniture Manufacturer. Pet. Oct. 25. First meeting, Nov. 11 at 12; George Hotel, Walsall. Off. Ass. Kinnear. Sol. W. H. Duignan, Walsall.

WILDS, JOHN, commonly known as JOHN TWIVEY, Carlton, near South, Yorkshire, Dealer in Flax and Potatoes. Pet. Oct. 23. First meeting, Nov. 8 at 11; Leeds. Off. Ass. Young. Sol. H. B. Harle, Leeds.

WORTHINGTON, HENRY, & WILLIAM GILLIBRAND, Guide, Lower Darwent, near Blackburn, Lancashire, Cotton Manufacturers (Worthington &

(Co.). Pet. Oct. 18. Registrar, Wilde: first meeting, Nov. 8 at 12; Manchester. Off. Ass. Pott. Sols. Sale, Worthington, Shipman, & Seddon, Booth-street, Manchester.

FRIDAY, Nov. 1, 1861.

ALWOOD, THOMAS, Nottingham, and late of Stanton-in-the-Wolds, Nottingham, Farmer. Pet. Oct. 29. Registrar, Waterfield: first meeting, Nov. 12 at 11; Nottingham. Off. Ass. Harris. Sols. Cowley & Eversall, Nottingham.

APPELBY, WILLIAM, Broad-street, Sheffield-park, Sheffield, Fishmonger. Pet. Oct. 25. First meeting, Nov. 14 at 12; Sheffield. Off. Ass. Wake and Rodgers.

AMBER, ROBERT, 25, Oxford-road, Islington, Middlesex, and 10, Poultry, London, Metal Merchant and Commission Agent. Pet. Oct. 31 (in form pauperis). Registrar, Miller: first meeting, Nov. 23 at 2; Basinghall-street. Off. Ass. Edwards.

BARKER, HENRY JOHN, Lane's Hotel, St. Alban's-place, Haymarket, Middlesex. Pet. Oct. 29. Registrar, Hazlitt: first meeting, Nov. 14 at 11; Basinghall-street. Off. Ass. Graham. Sols. Lewis & Lewis, 10, Ely-place, Holborn, London.

BARKER, JOHN, Horsforth, Cloth Manufacturer. Pet. Oct. 31. First meeting, Nov. 14 at 11; Leeds. Off. Ass. Hope. Sol. B. Cariss, Leeds.

BATES, HENRY, Holts-hill-lane, Walsall, Coal Dealer. Pet. Oct. 29. First meeting, Nov. 12 at 12; Walsall. Off. Ass. Clarke. Sol. W. H. Duigan, Walsall.

BELSON, ROBERT HOWES, Rose-corner, King-street, Norwich, Plumber, Glazier and Painter. Pet. Oct. 30. Registrar, Miller: first meeting, Nov. 19 at 3; Basinghall-street. Off. Ass. Edwards. Sols. Sole, Turner and Turner, 68, Aldermanbury, London; J. G. Atkinson, Norwich.

BENBELL, PETER, Moor-place, Kennington-road, Surrey, Surgeon. Pet. Oct. 30. Registrar, Winslow: first meeting, Nov. 23 at 1; Basinghall-street. Off. Ass. Pennell. Sol. F. George, Sise-lane, London.

BENTHAM, ALEXANDER, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Cheese and Bacon Factor. Pet. Oct. 23. Registrar, Gibson: first meeting, Nov. 13, at 12 30; Newcastle-upon-Tyne. Off. Ass. Baker. Sols. Potts & Scarisbrick, Sunderland.

BIRCH, WILLIAM HENRY, 19, Cambridge-terrace, Edgware-road Middlesex, Surgeon. Pet. Oct. 30. Registrar, Hazlitt: first meeting, Nov. 16, at 11; Basinghall-street. Off. Ass. Stansfield, Sol. G. H. Thistlewood, Symond's-inn, Chancery-lane, London.

CARTWRIGHT, GEORGE, Wolverhampton, Stafford, Butcher. Pet. Oct. 29. first meeting, Nov. 13, at 11; Birmingham. Off. Ass. Whitmore. Sols. James & Knight, 36, Bennett's-hill, Birmingham.

CLARKE, JOSEPH, Oswestry, Fruiterer and Fish Dealer. Pet. Oct. 26. Registrar, Croxon: first meeting, Nov. 14, at 12; Oswestry. Off. Ass. Croxon. Sol. W. I. Bull, Oswestry.

CASE, RACHAEL, 25, High-street, Freetown, and 1, Greenhagh row, Freetown, Bury, Lancaster, Grocer, Tea Dealer, and Shopkeeper, and Remeller. Pet. Oct. 30. Registrar, Grundy: first meeting, Nov. 20 at 11; Bury. Off. Ass. Grundy. Sol. Watson, Bury, Lancashire.

CHAPMAN, WILLIAM HENRY, Garway-road, Westbourne-grove, Middlesex, Livery Stable Keeper. Pet. Nov. 1. Registrar, Hazlitt: first meeting, Nov. 16, at 11 30; Basinghall-street. Off. Ass. Graham. Sols. Lawrence, Fews, & Boyer, 14, Old Jewry-chambers, London.

CHE, JANE, 2, Wier-fields, St. Leonard's, Devonshire, and 57, High-street, Exeter, Hosier, Haberdasher, and Stay Maker. Pet. Oct. 31. Registrar, Daw: first meeting, Nov. 15 at 11; Exeter. Off. Ass. Daw. Sol. T. Flood, 14, Castle-street, Exeter.

COLLEY, ROBERT LATHAM, Barnsley, Yorkshire, Provision Dealer. Pet. Oct. 29. First meeting, Nov. 13 at 11; Leeds. Off. Ass. Hope. Sols. Newman & Son, or Bond & Barwick, Leeds.

CROSBY, ELIZABETH, Hazel's Cottage, near Prescott, Lancaster. Pet. Oct. 30. Registrar, Ansell: first meeting, Nov. 13 at 11; St. Helens. Off. Ass. R. Anderson.

CUT, GEORGE, 5, Barbican, London, Optician. Pet. Oct. 21. Registrar, Higgins: first meeting, Nov. 19 at 12 30; Basinghall-street. Off. Ass. Cannan. Sols. Digby & Sharp, 1, Circus-place, Finsbury.

DEAN, JAMES, 102, Foregate-street, Chester, Furniture Broker, and Dealer in Glass, China, and Earthenware. Pet. Oct. 26. Registrar, Watson: first meeting, Nov. 9 at 12; Basinghall-street. Off. Ass. Watson. Sol. J. Cartwright.

DEKENS, ROBERT, Yarwell, Northampton, Wheelwright. Pet. Oct. 29. Registrar, Winslow: first meeting, Nov. 23 at 12; Basinghall-street. Off. Ass. Pennell. Sols. Wright & Bonner, 13, London-street, Fenchurch-street, London.

FISHER, JAMES, & JAMES MCLEAN, Reigate, Surrey, Builders. Pet. Sept. 16. Comm. Holroyd: Nov. 12 at 2, and Dec. 10 at 12; Basinghall-street. Off. Ass. Edwards. Sol. H. H. Pool, 58, Bartholomew-close, London.

FOLAT, EDWARD, 10, Clifton-crescent, Asylum-road, Old Kent-road, Surrey, Builder. Pet. Oct. 28. Registrar, Abraham: first meeting, Nov. 13 at 1; Basinghall-street. Off. Ass. Bell.

FRANKSON, EMMA, 16, Brewer-street, Somers Town, Middlesex, Draper and Haberdasher. Pet. Oct. 30. Registrar, Abraham: first meeting, Nov. 20 at 12; Basinghall-street. Off. Ass. Bell. Sol. B. May, Russell-square.

GALLABER, JOHN HUTCHINSON, Hazel's-cottage, Prescott, Slater and Plasterer. Pet. Oct. 30. Registrar, Ansell: first meeting, Nov. 13 at 11; Saint Helen's. Off. Ass. Ansell. Sol. R. Anderson, 6, King-street, Liverpool.

GOODERED, JOHN FREDERICK, 222, Piccadilly, Middlesex, Eating-house Keeper. Pet. Oct. 30. Registrar, Higgins: first meeting, Nov. 19 at 2; Basinghall-street. Off. Ass. Cannan. Sols. H. Pook, 27, Basinghall-street, or E. Lewis, Great Marlborough-street.

GOULDING, HENRY, 29, New Compton-street, Soho, Middlesex, Painter, Writer, and Decorator. Pet. Oct. 28. Registrar, Higgins: first meeting, Nov. 19 at twelve; Basinghall-street. Off. Ass. Cannan. Sol. B. Peverley, 19, Coleman-street.

GOULDER, HENRY, Jun., Kimberley, Nottinghamshire, Bricklayer and Builder. Pet. Oct. 31. Registrar, Waterfield: first meeting, Nov. 14 at 11; Nottingham. Off. Ass. Harris. Sols. Cowley & Eversall, Nottingham.

HARRIS, JONATHAN, Leeds, Woollen Cloth Manufacturer and Commission Agent for the sale of Woollen Cloth. Pet. Oct. 28. First meeting, Nov. 12 at 11; Leeds. Off. Ass. Hope. Sol. T. Simpson, Leeds.

HARRINGTON, WILLIAM, 125, Westgate-street, Gloucester, Wine & Spirit Merchant. Pet. Oct. 17. Registrar, Orme: first meeting, Nov. 12 at 12; Bristol. Off. Ass. Acraman. Sols. J. Scott, 4, Skinner-street, Snowhill, London, or Abbott, Lucas, & Leonard, Albion-chambers, Bristol.

HARRIS, THEOPHILUS, 12, Gloucester-street, Queen's-square, Bloomsbury, Middlesex, Law Clerk. Pet. Oct. 29 (in form pauperis). Registrar, Miller: Nov. 22 at 10; Basinghall-street. Off. Ass. Edwards.

HART, NEWSON, Cran-ford, Suffolk, Farmer. Pet. Oct. 30. Registrar, Miller: first meeting, Nov. 19 at 3 30; Basinghall-street. Off. Ass. Edwards. Sols. Mosely Taylor, & Mosely, 9, Old Jewry-chambers, London; or to H. K. Mosely, Framlingham, Suffolk.

HEATHCOTE, ROBERT, 31, Bell-yard, Temple-bar, Middlesex, Licensed Victualler. Pet. Oct. 31. Registrar, Abraham: first meeting, Nov. 20 at 11 30; Basinghall-street. Off. Ass. Bell.

HOPEWELL, EDWARD, 62, Coleman-street, London, Mercantile Agent. Pet. Oct. 29 (in form pauperis). Registrar, Higgins: first meeting, Nov. 19 at 10 30; Basinghall-street. Off. Ass. Cannan.

HOWICK, JOHN, 27, Weymouth-terrace, Hackney-road, Middlesex, Builder and Contractor. Pet. Oct. 25 (in form pauperis). Registrar, Hazlitt: first meeting, Nov. 11 at 11; Basinghall-street. Off. Ass. Stansfield. Sol. H. E. Massey, 7, Old Jewry, London.

HUTTON, JOHN ARTHUR, formerly of Great Chart Mills, near Ashford, Kent, Miller, then of Ashford, Kent, then of 1, Devonshire-place, Edgware-road, and then and now of 3, Westbourne-grove-terrace, Westbourne-grove, Bayswater, Middlesex, Clerk in her Majesty's War Office. Pet. Oct. 28. Registrar, Higgins: first meeting, Nov. 11 at 11; Basinghall-street. Off. Ass. Cannan. Sols. Nichols and Clark, 9, Cook's-court, Lincoln's-inn.

JONES, JOHN MARSHALL, 10, Missionary-place, Walworth, Surrey, Commission Agent. Pet. Oct. 30. Registrar, Miller: Nov. 19 at 3; Basinghall-street. Off. Ass. Edwards. Sol. J. Hall, 14, Basinghall-street, London.

KENTISH, THOMAS, 163, Grange-road, Bermondsey, Surrey, Bread and Biscuit Baker. Pet. Oct. 29 (informa pauperis). Registrar, Winslow: first meeting, Nov. 3 at 12 30; Basinghall-street. Off. Ass. Pennell.

KING, GEORGE, Holly-street, Sheffield, Beerhouse Keeper and Dealer in Tobacco, and Table Knife Cutter. Pet. Oct. 25. First meeting, Nov. 14 at 11; Sheffield. Off. Ass. Wake & Rodgers.

LAMB, JOHN, Nottingham, General Clothier and Salesman. Pet. Oct. 29. Registrar, Waterfield: first meeting, Nov. 12 at 11; Nottingham. Off. Ass. Harris. Sol. S. Maples, Nottingham.

LAMPRELL, WILLIAM ALLESTON, 914, Long-lane, London, Carpenter and Builder. Pet. Oct. 30. Registrar, Miller: first meeting, Nov. 22 at 10 30; Basinghall-street. Off. Ass. Edwards.

LAW, WILLIAM ALEXANDER, 13, Mercer's-terrace, Stepney, Middlesex, and late of White Post-lane, Hackney, Commercial Traveller. Pet. Oct. 31. Registrar, Miller: first meeting, Nov. 22 at 11 30; Basinghall-street. Off. Ass. Edwards.

LAYCOCK, JOHN, Jun., Kirkstall-road, Leeds, Cloth Fuller. Pet. Oct. 31. First meeting, Nov. 14 at 11; Leeds. Off. Ass. Young. Sols. Terry & Watson, Bradford, or to Bond & Barwick, Leeds.

LEVINSON, BENJAMIN, 22, Church-street, Spitalfields, late of 174, Sidney-street, Commercial-road East, Middlesex, Wholesale and Retail Clothier and Tailor. Pet. Oct. 29. Registrar, Abraham: first meeting, Nov. 12 at 12; Basinghall-street. Off. Ass. Bell. Sol. Abbott, 1, St. Mark's-street, Great Prescott-croft, London.

LIVES, CHARLES, Dog and Partridge, Hollington, Staffordshire, Licensed Victualler, Grocer, and Provision Dealer. Pet. Oct. 28. Registrar, Daniel: first meeting, Nov. 11 at 11; Cheadle. Off. Ass. Daniel. Sol. Tennant, Hanley.

LOCKS, WILLIAM, Hoxton Old Town, Middlesex, Timber Merchant. Pet. Oct. 29. Registrar, Abraham: Nov. 12 at 11 30; Basinghall-street. Off. Ass. Johnson. Sols. Wright & Venn, 2, Paper buildings, Temple.

LONG, JOHN ATKINS, Wakefield, Schoolmaster. Pet. Oct. 31. First meeting, Nov. 14 at 11; Leeds. Off. Ass. Young. Sols. Bond & Barwick, Leeds.

MANSFIELD, RALPH, Manchester, Lithographer. Pet. Oct. 30. Registrar, Simons: first meeting, Nov. 13 at 12; Manchester. Off. Ass. Fraser. Sol. Heywood, Dickinson-street, Manchester.

MARKS, PHILIP, Ambicote, Oldswinford, Staffordshire, Schoolmaster. Pet. Oct. 29. First meeting, Nov. 13 at 11; Birmingham. Off. Ass. Kinnear. Sols. James & Knight, Birmingham.

MARSHALL, JOHN, 12, Crescent, Minories, London, Glass and China Dealer. Pet. Oct. 29. Registrar, Hazlitt: first meeting, Nov. 12 at 1; Basinghall-street. Off. Ass. Graham. Sol. H. Pook, 27, Basinghall-street, London.

MEREDITH, EDWARD WILLIAM, 17, Mulberry-street, Hulme, Pet. Oct. 28. Registrar, Hulton: first meeting, Nov. 12 at 10; Salford. Off. Ass. Hulton. Sol. J. E. Dawson, Bridge-street, Manchester.

MOUBS, WILLIAM, 18, Ponsomby-place, Vauxhall-road, Westminster, Journeyman Carpenter. Pet. Oct. 29. Registrar (informa pauperis), Higgins: first meeting, Nov. 19 at 10; Basinghall-street. Off. Ass. Cannan.

MONDAY, ABRAHAM, & WILLIAM JOHN NICHOLS, 224, Milk-street, London, Fruiting Manufacturers. Pet. Oct. 30. Registrar, Higgins: first meeting, Nov. 19 at 1; Basinghall-street. Off. Ass. Cannan. Sol. T. Beard, 10, Basinghall-street.

MERCER, FRANCIS MONTIEN, Midhurst, Sussex, Licensed Victualler. Pet. Oct. 30. Registrar, Miller: first meeting, Nov. 19 at 2 30; Basinghall-street. Off. Ass. Edwards. Sol. G. White, 8, Dances-inn, Strand, London, and Guildford, Surrey.

MOODY, CHARLES, 88, Goswell-road, Clerkenwell, Middlesex, Pork Butcher, Poulterer, and Cheesemonger. Pet. Oct. 26. Registrar, Higgins: first meeting, Nov. 19 at 11 30; Basinghall-street. Off. Ass. Cannan. Sol. Hill, Bury-croft, St. Mary Axe.

MOORE, CONSTANTINE, 264, London-road, Surrey, Butcher. Pet. Oct. 31. Registrar, Abraham: Nov. 20, at 10 30; Basinghall-street. Off. Ass. Bell. Sols. Lewis and Son, Wilmington-square.

NEEDHAM, JOHN, Potterhanworth, Lincoln, Licensed Victualler and Labourer. Pet. Oct. 28. Registrar, Uppeley: first meeting, Nov. 11, at 12; Lincoln. Off. Ass. Uppeley. Sols. Brown and Son, Lincoln.

NEWBORN, THOMAS, Longton, Stoke-upon-Trent, Stafford, Builder. Pet. Oct. 29. Registrar, Keary: first meeting, Nov. 12 at 4; Stoke-upon-Trent. Off. Ass. Keary. Sol. R. W. Litchfield, Newcastle-under-Lyme.

NEWCOMB, JOHN DEAN, 1, Clyde-square, Northumberland-terrace, Everton, Liverpool, Solicitor to an Insurance Company and a Clerk. Pet. Oct. 30. Registrar, Hime: first meeting, Nov. 13, at 3; Liverpool. Off. Ass. Hime. Sol. S. O. Husband, 9, James-street, Liverpool.

NICHOLSON, JOHN, formerly of Chester-le-street, Durham, Publican, Brewer. Pet. Oct. 29. Registrar, Bramwell: first meeting, Nov. 12, at 10; Durham. Off. Ass. Bramwell. Sol. J. E. Marshall, Claypall, Durham.

NUTCHEY, DAVID, Beverley, York, Land Surveyor, Civil Engineer, and Contractor. Pet. Oct. 31. First meeting, Nov. 14, at 11; Leeds. Off. Ass. Hope. Sol. B. Cariss, Leeds.

PEARSON, WILLIAM, 107, Rochdale-road, Manchester, Baker and Flour Dealer. Pet. Oct. 29. Registrar, Simons: first meeting, Nov. 12 at 12; Manchester. Off. Ass. Pott. Sol. Hewitt, 20, Bond-street, Manchester.

PIDDING, WILLIAM, formerly of Putney, Surrey, Inventor and Patentee. Pet. Oct. 31 (in form pauperis). Registrar, Miller: first meeting, Nov. 22 at 11; Basinghall-street. Off. Ass. Edwards.

PINNELL, JANE, 18, Red Cross-square, London, Widow (Silversmith). Pet. Nov. 1, Registrar, Abrahall: first meeting, Nov. 20 at 11; Basinghall-street. Off. Ass. Johnson. Sol. Stopher, Coleman-street.

POWELL, WILLIAM THOMAS, Tenbury, Worcester, and of Knighton, Radnor, Draper. Pet. Oct. 10. Com. Sanders: Nov. 11 and Dec. 2 at 11; Birmingham. Off. Ass. Kinnear. Sol. C. Bridges, Birmingham.

RAULT, LEWIS, Calais-house, Great Warner-street, Clerkenwell, and 101, Leather-lane, Middlesex, and now of 128, Holborn-hill, Yeast Contractor and Wine Merchant. Pet. Oct. 24. Registrar, Abrahall: first meeting, Nov. 15 at 1.30; Basinghall-street. Off. Ass. Johnson.

RIVETT, THOMAS, Stockport, Chester, Cotton Yarn Doubler. Pet. Oct. 21. Registrar, Wilde: first meeting, Nov. 15 at 12; Manchester. Off. Ass. Herniman. Sols. Earle, Earle, Hoppes, & Orford, Manchester.

ROBINSON, DAVID, Lincoln, Joiner and Builder, and Undertaker. Pet. Oct. 31. Registrar, Uppley: Nov. 14, at 10; Lincoln. Off. Ass. Uppley. Sols. Brown & Son, Lincoln.

SCHOFIELD, JOSEPH, Oak, Hollins with Oldham, Lancaster, Farmer. Pet. Oct. 25. First meeting, Nov. 22, at 12; Oldham. Off. Ass. Summer-scales. Sol. W. Ashcroft, Oldham.

SHARP, JOHN, 45, Saint Phillip's-road, Sheffield, Toolfitter. Pet. Oct. 25. First meeting, Nov. 14, at 12; Sheffield. Off. Ass. Wake and Rodgers, Bank-street, Sheffield.

SKINNER, GEORGE PRICE, of Eaton-place, Peckham-rye, Surrey, and of Lordship-lane, East Dulwich, Brickmaker. Pet. Oct. 29. Registrar, Higgins: Nov. 19 at 11; Basinghall-street. Off. Ass. Cannan. Sol. M. Abrahams, 17, Gresham-street.

SMITH, THOMAS, Spennymore, Durham, Joiner and Builder. Pet. Oct. 29. Registrar, Trotter: first meeting, Nov. 12 at 10; Bishop Auckland. Off. Ass. Trotter. Sol. W. Brignal, Durham.

STOCKER, CHARLES HENRY, Pear Tree-cottage, Acton-green, Middlesex. Pet. Oct. 31. Registrar, Abrahall: first meeting, Nov. 15 at 11; Basinghall-street. Off. Ass. Johnson. Sols. Lewis and Lewis, Ely-place.

SUMMERS, THOMAS, Golden Lion Public-house, Goodman's-yard, Minorities, London, Licensed Victualler. Pet. Oct. 31. Registrar, Abrahall: first meeting, Nov. 15 at 12; Basinghall-street. Off. Ass. Johnson. Sol. Abbott, 1, St. Mark-street, Great Prescott-street.

TERBY, CHARLES, 6, Elliott's-row, Lower-road, Islington, Middlesex, Grocer and Cheesemonger. Pet. Oct. 31. Registrar, Hazlitt: first meeting, Nov. 12 at 12; Basinghall-street. Off. Ass. Graham. Sol. Wells, 47, Moorgate-street, London.

THOMAS, LEOPOLD POLLARD, St. George's-terrace, Kilburn, Middlesex, Gent. Pet. Oct. 31 (in form pauperis). Registrar, Hazlitt: first meeting, Nov. 14 at 11.30; Basinghall-street. Off. Ass. Stansfield.

TURTLE, JOHN GABRIEL, Poole, Dorsetshire, Shoe Maker. Pet. Oct. 29. Registrar, Winslow: first meeting, Nov. 23 at 12.30; Basinghall-street. Off. Ass. Pennell. Sols. Flux & Angles, 9, Mincing-lane, London, or to H. W. Dickenson Poole, Dorsetshire.

URTON, GEORGE, Ruby-place, Copeland-street, Greenheys, Manchester, Plumber, Glazier, and Gas Fitter. Pet. Oct. 31. Registrar, Wilde: first meeting, Nov. 14 at 12; Manchester. Off. Ass. Pott. Sols. Cobbett & Wheeler, Brown-street, Manchester.

WADE, ROBERT, Church, Lancashire, Joiner and Builder. Pet. Oct. 28. Registrar, Simons: Nov. 11 at 12; Manchester. Off. Ass. Pennell. Sols. Sale, Worthington, Shipman, & Seddon, Booth-street, Manchester.

WALNORTH, THOMAS, 32, Bradford-street, Manchester, Flour Dealer. Pet. Oct. 24. First meeting, Dec. 50 at 12. Off. Ass. Kay.

WHITE, MARK, King's Head Public House, 17, Leather-lane, Middlesex, Licensed Victualler. Pet. Oct. 31. Registrar, Higgins: first meeting, Nov. 19, at 2.30; Basinghall-street. Off. Ass. Cannan. Sol. W. R. Buchanan, 13, Basinghall-street.

WILDE, ROBERT, Ruyton-of-the-Eleven-Towns, Salop, Tailor. Pet. Oct. 16. Registrar, Croxon: first meeting, Nov. 14 at 11; Oswestry. Off. Ass. Croxon. Sol. C. Chandler, Shrewsbury.

WILD, WILLIAM, & JAMES BOWKER, Bury, Cotton Manufacturers (Wild & Bowker). Pet. Oct. 25. Registrar, Simons: first meeting, Nov. 12 at 12; Manchester. Off. Ass. Herniman. Sols. Slater & Myers, Fountain-street, Manchester.

WILLISON, WILLIAM, Stamford, Lincolnshire, Printer. Pet. Oct. 18. Registrar, Waterfield: first meeting, Nov. 14 at 11; Nottingham. Off. Ass. Harris. Sols. W. French, Stamford, or J. T. Brewster, Nottingham.

WILLIAMSON, BENJAMIN, 8, Providence-street, Walworth, Surrey, General Dealer. Pet. Oct. 31 (in form pauperis). Registrar, Miller: first meeting, Nov. 22 at 1.30; Basinghall-street. Off. Ass. Edwards.

MEETINGS FOR PROOF OF DEBTS.

TUESDAY, OCT. 29, 1861.

ROBERT HICKS, 47, Mortimer-street, Cavendish-square, Middlesex, and 13, Limes-villas, Lewisham, Kent, House and Estate Agent and Surveyor. Nov. 27 at 2; Basinghall-street.—**JAMES MASON**, Ware, Hertford, Maltster. Nov. 27 at 2.30; Basinghall-street.—**RAYMOND D'ARCY NEWTON**, 2, Warwick-square, London, Advertising Agent and Dealer in Newspapers. Nov. 8 at 12; Basinghall-street.—**RICHARD GEORGE PAPPS**, 32, Barbican, London, Builder. Nov. 21 at 1; Basinghall-street.—**MARK FELTHAM**, West Winch, Norfolk, Miller. Nov. 20 at 12; Basinghall-street.—**GRINDER ANTHON MARTIN AAS**, 19, Colchester-street, London, Shipbroker. Nov. 20 at 1.30; Basinghall-street.—**GEORGE BARNETT**, 21, Felix-terrace, Liverpool-road, Islington, Middlesex, Butcher. Nov. 20 at 12.30; Basinghall-street.—**JOHN EVERETT**, late of Rainham, and now of Green Hill-grove, Little Ilford, Essex, Carpenter. Nov. 20 at 1; Basinghall-street.—**JOHN AXEL TALEN**, 4, Whitley-villas, Caledonian-road, Islington, Middlesex.—Nov. 20 at 11.30; Basinghall-street.—**JOHN LEVENSARGE**, 61a, Tabernacle-walk, St. Leonard, Shore-ditch, and 8, Devon-villas, Buckingham-road, De-beauvoir Town, Middlesex, Wheelwright. Nov. 20 at 11; Basinghall-street.—**MATTHEW HUTCHINSON**, 48, Mark-lane, London, and of the Paragon, Blackheath, Kent, Hemp and Flax Dealer. Nov. 20 at 2; Basinghall-street.—**WILLIAM WHITTEM**, Meriden, Warwick, Grocer and

Draper. Nov. 29 at 11; Birmingham. **RICHARD BAKER**, Ipsley, Warwick, Needle Dealer. Nov. 29 at 11; Birmingham.—**HENRY RAWSON**, Manchester, Stationer and Printer. Nov. 19 at 12; Manchester.—**WILLIAM BROWN TAYLOR**, Norwich, Tobacconist and Tea Dealer. Nov. 8 at 1; Basinghall-street.—**WILLIAM HENRY ROWE**, 7 Gloucester-place, Regents-park, Middlesex, Builder. Nov. 20 at 11.30; Basinghall-street.

ESTATE PLANS, &c.

T. PETTIT & CO.,

LITHOGRAPHERS & GENERAL PRINTERS

FRITH-STREET, SOHO-SQUARE, LONDON,

BEG to inform Solicitors, in London and the Provinces, that they are prepared to execute every description of Parliamentary, Law, and General Printing and Lithography, with care and despatch, including

MAPS, PLANS OF ESTATES, RAILWAY PLAN WORK, BOOKS OF REFERENCE FOR DEPOSIT, MINUTES OF EVIDENCE, BRIEFS, &c.

A large staff of competent workmen employed to execute all orders with celerity.

TYLER AND COMPANY,

(Late GOODCHAP, TYLER, & Co.)

ACCOUNTANTS,

13, GRESHAM STREET, E. C.

During a practice of twenty years, T. & Co. have had great experience in winding up Joint Stock Companies in Chancery; the investigation of intricate and disputed accounts; the liquidation of estates under deeds of inspection, assignment, and composition; and the audit of the accounts of public companies.

The management of estates under the New Bankruptcy Act undertaken. Terms moderate.

TO REGISTRARS OF COUNTY COURTS

SOLICITORS, AND ACCOUNTANTS.—The Advertiser who has for twelve years filled the office of Clerk to the Registrar of a County Court, and the greater part of that time with the sole management of the Court business and accounts, is desirous of obtaining a situation. Satisfactory references will be given.

Address, R. O. Post Office, Rugby.

JOHN GOSNELL & CO., PERFUMERS TO THE

QUEEN, beg to recommend the following Fashionable and Superior Articles for the TOILET to the special notice of all purchasers of Choice PERFUMERY.

John Gosnell & Co.'s JOCKEY CLUB PERFUME, in universal request as the most admired perfume for the handkerchief, price 2s. 6d.

John Gosnell & Co.'s LA NOBLESE PERFUME—a most delicate perfume of exquisite fragrance.

John Gosnell & Co.'s GARIBALDI BOUQUET—a most choice and fashionable perfume.

John Gosnell & Co.'s RUSSIAN LEATHER PERFUME—a very fashionable and agreeable perfume.

John Gosnell & Co.'s BALL-ROOM COMPANION or FOUNTAIN PERFUMES. Elegant Novelties, in the form of Portable Handkerchief Perfumes in a neat case, which emits on pressure a jet of most refreshing perfume. Price 1s. and 1s. 6d. each.

John Gosnell & Co.'s LA NOBLESE POMADE—elegantly perfumed, and highly recommended for beautifying and promoting the growth of the Hair.

John Gosnell & Co.'s GOLDEN OIL—Mœlline—Macassar Oil—Bears Grease, &c., for the Hair.

John Gosnell & Co.'s CHERRY TOOTH PASTE is greatly superior to any Tooth Powder, gives the Teeth a pearl-like whiteness, protects the enamel from decay, and imparts a pleasing fragrance to the breath.

John Gosnell & Co.'s AMBROSIAL SHAVING CREAM, 1s. and 1s. 6d. in pots; also, in compressible tubes, for the convenience of persons travelling, price 1s.

Manufactory, 12, Three King-court, Lombard-street, London.

VIRGIN VINEGAR for PICKLING, warranted

made from Malt only, and perfectly pure. Families supplied.

SARSON & SON, near the Gate, City-road. Carriers call daily.

SPANISH FLY—248, High Holborn, Alex. Ross'

Cantharides Oil is prepared from the Spanish Fly, which so moderately and regularly stimulates the skin as to make the hair and whiskers grow quickly. Sold at 3s. 6d., sent by return of post for 54 stamps. Microscopic inspection of the scalp gratis from 10 till 6.

ALEX. ROSS' HAIR DYE turns red or grey hair

a beautiful light or dark colour. A. R. dyes ladies hair in one hour, gentlemen's in half that time, and whiskers in a few minutes. Ross' Toilet Magazine 1d., monthly; had of all booksellers, or for two stamps, 248, High Holborn, London.

HOLLOWAY'S OINTMENT AND PILLS—

Pimples, Boils, Carbuncles, Abscesses.—These maladies arise from some obstruction to the free circulation of the blood through the blood vessels or capillaries; and the only rational mode of cure consists in removing the local impediment, at the same time that any impurity engendered by the stoppage should be filtered from the blood. Holloway's Ointment applied to the part effects the first, his Pills accomplish the latter object. The inflamed skin derives softness, coolness, and ease from the application of this unguent, which gradually penetrates to the affected tissues, and soon restores the circulation and its channels to a healthy condition, and saves the sufferer from most serious diseases, which too frequently follow from carelessness, or injudicious medical treatment.

ar-
ou
ov
oe
et

S

o-
ar
anc

Ol
ec
er

ne
u
a
c

er-

S

fu
ri
un
or

HI

ro
de

re

er

ne

on

ED

er

ag

ed

a

o

ari

le

the

6d

re

ed

ed

ed

ed

ed

ed

ed

ed

ed

ed

ed

ed

ed

ed

ed

ed

ed

ed

ed

ed

ed

ed

ed

ed

ed

ed

ed

ed

ed

ed

ed

ed

ed

ed